For Reference only

PAPERS.

National Education (Ireland).

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
19 *April* 1859.

[*Price* 2*s.* 8*d.*]

254.

Under 28 *oz.*

1859 Sess. I
XXI. Pt. II

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons, dated 8 April 1859;—*for*,

A COPY "of all CORRESPONDENCE, from the 1st day of July 1857 to the present Date, which passed between the Commissioners of National Education in *Ireland* and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh*, Head Inspector of National Schools, omitting such only as is of a mere routine Nature, or not bearing upon any Matter in Dispute between Mr. *Kavanagh* and any other Party, excluding also the Returns respecting the Ballandine National Schools, and so much of the Correspondence, &c., as is contained in Parliamentary Paper, No. 386, of last Session:"

"And, RETURN of the NAMES of the MEMBERS appointed on the SPECIAL COMMITTEE of the 11th day of September 1857, in reference to Mr. *Kavanagh*, with the Names of those subsequently added; the precise Matters which the Committee was first appointed to investigate, with a Statement of any others afterwards added; the Dates of the several Sittings of the Committee, with the Members present at each:—And, COPY of the MINUTES of the Business transacted; of the REPORT of the COMMITTEE, with the Names of those Members (as laid before the Board on the 27th day of November 1857) of the Committee present when it was adopted; of the NAMES of the COMMISSIONERS present at the Board's Meeting of the 27th day of November 1857; and of all COMMUNICATIONS which the Members of the Board or other Public Parties may have forwarded to the Commissioners, or to the Resident Commissioner, in reference to the Case of Mr. *Kavanagh*, within the whole of the above Period."

Office of National Education, Dublin, 12 April 1859.

MAURICE CROSS, JAMES KELLY, Secretaries.

(*Mr. Maguire.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed*, 19 *April* 1859.

CONTENTS.

No. 1.—(From A. to N.)—Copy of all Correspondence, from the 1st day of July 1857 to the present date, which passed between the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, and Mr. James W. Kavanagh, Head Inspector of National Schools, omitting such only as is of a mere routine nature, or not bearing upon any matter in dispute between Mr. Kavanagh and any other party, excluding also the Returns respecting the Ballandine National Schools, and so much of the Correspondence, &c., as is contained in Parliamentary Paper, No. 386, of last Session - - - - - - - - - - p. 3

No. 2.—Return of the Names of the Members appointed on the Special Committee of the 11th day of September 1857, in reference to Mr. Kavanagh, with the names of those subsequently added; the precise matters which the Committee was first appointed to investigate, with a statement of any others afterwards added, the dates of the several sittings of the Committee, with the Members present at each - - - - - - - p. 223

No. 3.—Copy of the Minutes of the Business transacted - - - - - - - p. 224

No. 4.—Copy of the Report of the Committee, with the Names of those Members (as laid before the Board on the 27th day of November 1857) of the Committee present when it was adopted - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 231

No. 5.—Return of the Names of the Commissioners present at the Board's Meeting of the 27th day of November 1857 - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 245

No. 6.—Copy of all Communications which the Members of the Board or other public parties may have forwarded to the Commissioners, or to the Resident Commissioner, in reference to the case of Mr. Kavanagh, within the whole of the above period - - - p. 245

— No. 1. —

COPY of all CORRESPONDENCE, from the 1st day of July 1857 to the present Date, which passed between the Commissioners of National Education in *Ireland* and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh*, Head Inspector of National Schools, omitting such only as is of a mere routine Nature, or nor bearing upon any matter in dispute between Mr. *Kavanagh* and any other party, excluding also the Returns respecting the Ballandine National Schools, and so much of the Correspondence, &c., as is contained in Parliamentary Paper, No. 386, of last Session."

Note.—In preparing the Return, it was found necessary, in order to render it intelligible, to include the whole of the Correspondence relating to each case, without limiting it to the dates specified in the Order of the House of Commons:

Also, it was considered right to give the Messrs. Fleming and Clarke, Inspectors, an opportunity of reply to Mr. Kavanagh's observations on their defence of the charges brought against them by him. These replies are included in the Return, by order of the Board, dated 3 December 1858.

Office of National Education, Dublin, 12 April 1859.

Maurice Cross, *James Kelly*, Secretaries.

No. 1. (A).

CORRESPONDENCE between the Commissioners of National Education and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools in *Ireland*); and with Mr. *H. P. Clarke*, Inspector of National Schools, relative to the Examination of the Staff of Paid Monitors in District 40 (Wexford), from the 21st January 1857 to the 9th of August 1858.

Gentlemen, Grenville, Rathgar, 21 January 1857.

I BEG leave to request your attention to some points in connexion with the examination of the staff of paid monitors in district 40, Wexford.

1. The appointment of the monitors is highly injudicious as to locality. Of nine monitors, three are in schools in the town of Wexford, one in a school three miles from town (Castlebridge), and one in a school (Piercestown), four miles; or five of the nine are in Wexford or its suburban schools. Of 10 monitresses, all are in two convent schools in the town, except one girl in Kilturk National School. That is, one school has five monitresses (Wexford, No. 2.), another has four (Wexford, No. 1.), and all the rest of the district has the remaining one monitress. Of boys and girls, 14 of the 19 are attached to schools in Wexford, or in its immediate vicinity.

2. The examination of the monitors by Mr. Clarke is incomplete and unsatisfactory. The whole 19 should have been examined orally on at least lesson books and arithmetic, and those of higher standing on other subjects, but this has been omitted. Seven of the 10 girls were not examined orally on the spelling book, or geography (except outline maps), nor on arithmetic or lesson books, either orally or in writing, so that, so far as I know, the entire seven may be utterly ignorant of arithmetic and the matter of the lesson books. The written exercises of these 7 was confined to grammar and dictation. There are no dockets for eight of the 10 girls, and I know nothing of their age, standing, &c.

3. I beg leave to call attention to Mr. Clarke's recommendation that Mr. Hanrahan, master of the Wexford Male, No. 1 National School, should receive the gratuity for the instruction of the two monitors in his own school, the monitor in Wexford Male, No. 2 School, and for the nine monitresses in the Wexford convent schools; or that one teacher shall receive the gratuities for

the instruction of 12 of the 19 monitors in the entire district. I am much surprised at this singular and improper recommendation. If the teacher of a school be not only able and willing, but also anxious to undertake the important charge of the entire instruction and training of a monitor, none should be appointed to the school. Although this master may superintend and direct the literary studies of these boys and girls, it is clear that it is in their capacity as mere scholars and not as monitors, as the teachers of their respective schools are the proper parties, who, during the entire day, direct and train them in the latter capacity. The plan proposed is fraught with moral danger as well as evident injustice. To the best of my recollection, Mr. Hanrahan got married within the last year or two, but even so, I could not suppose that the Commissioners would approve of a mixed evening school in a large town, taught by a master, and our 14 monitors from 14 to 18 years of age, boys and girls, attending there for the instruction which they should receive in the respective schools in which they daily assist: nor could I suppose that the heads of these schools would be deprived of the usual gratuity for the more important duty of training them in the practical and applied details of monitorial aptness.

4. The following is a summary of the results of the Examinations—

Schools.	Monitor.	Age.	Date of Appointment.	Recommendation.
		Years.		
Lady's Island - -	James Lambert -	17	5/53	Remove him; no gratuity.
Enniscorthy - -	Albert P. Long -	17	1/54	3d year's gratuity.
Piercestown - -	James Leary - -	16	7/54	Depress one year; no gratuity.
Newtownbarry - -	Martin Cowman -	17	10/54	3d year's gratuity.
Ferns - - -	Pat M'Donnelld -	16	10/54	Depress one year; no gratuity.
Wexford No. 1 - -	Martin Connor -	18	2/55	1st year's gratuity.
Ditto ditto - -	John Pierce - -	14	7/56	Remove him; no gratuity.
Ditto No. 2 - -	John Byrne - -	16	4/55	Fine 10 *s.*; gratuity (1st year) to James Scanlan, Master of School.
Castlebridge - -	Thomas Barron -	14	8/56	Remove him; no gratuity.
Kilturk (Female) -	Mary Smith - -	15	7/55	Gratuity of 1st year.
Wexford (Female) No. 2	Eliza Power - -	15	7/56	"
Ditto ditto - -	Margaret Codd -	- -	- -	"
Ditto ditto - -	M. A. Murphy -	- -	- -	Quite unfit; remove them.
Ditto ditto - -	Margaret Arkinson -	- -	- -	
Ditto ditto - -	Kate Wickham -	- -	- -	

The four last are quite unfit, so far as I can judge, from the extent of the examination submitted to me; the last two are junior monitors. The other four of the monitresses are in the Wexford Female No. 1 School.

Juniors { Ellen Roche, Margaret Hinds, Maria Brophy, Anast. M'Evey } All quite unfit; no particulars as to their ages.

5. The Commissioners will perceive from the returns as to this and other districts already sent in by me, that the whole question as to the monitorial staff requires early and serious consideration.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries.

P.S.—Eleven dockets, the only ones received, accompanying this letter.
J. W. K.

Sir, Education Office, 3 March 1857.

We enclose you copies of statements contained in a letter of Mr. Kavanagh, Head Inspector, of the 21st January last, and are to request that you will submit, with the least possible delay, for the information of the Board, such remarks as may occur to you relative to the management and conduct of the monitorial class entrusted for instruction to Mr. Hanrahan, the master of the Wexford No. 1 National School.

We are, &c.

(signed) *M. Cross*, *J. Kelly*, } Secretaries.

H. P. Clarke, Esq., Wexford.

(Dist. No. 40.)

Gentlemen, Wexford, 11 March 1857.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3d instant, enclosing for any remarks I may have to offer for the information of the Board, copies of certain statements contained in a letter of the 21st January from Mr. Kavanagh, Head Inspector.

I proceed at once to state that the numerous charges which he has thought proper to make against me in these statements may be classed under the following four heads as relating to—

1. The Wexford Monitorial School.

2. The local distribution of monitors in the district.

3. The manner in which I conducted the annual examination of monitors for 1856, held last November.

4. The qualification of certain monitors, and Mr. Kavanagh's recommendation for the dismissal of 10, against which I protest, and for the payment of certain gratuities, &c.

Mr. Kavanagh has mixed these subjects somewhat confusedly together, which will render it more troublesome than it otherwise would be to refute him. In replying to him I shall therefore not always follow the order of his statements, but that given above, and shall finish one subject before proceeding to the next.

1. And first, as to his strictures on the Wexford Monitorial School, and the payment of the teacher for the instruction of the 12 monitors taught in it. Mr. Kavanagh states that "the plan of it is fraught with moral danger," on the ground evidently of his mistaken and purely gratuitous supposition (and of the truth of which he had no evidence whatsoever), that it is a mixed school, attended by boys and girls of from 14 to 18 years of age.

Now that my recommendation to place the monitors of both sexes under the care of Mr. Hanrahan was not an improper one (Mr. Kavanagh is pleased to call it a singular and improper recommendation), but a highly proper and desirable one, will, I should think, appear evident from the facts that the superioresses of the convents, where all the female monitors are placed, were specially consulted by myself personally on the subject before I brought the matter under your notice at all, and before even I had selected the monitors. Had these ladies shown even the smallest disposition to disapprove of the plan I would never have proposed it to you. But they not only concurred in my views for the special instruction of those young persons, they gave it their warm approval, and expressed their gratification that so efficient a means for their improvement should be adopted. I notified the proposal to the office, and I received your letter of the 17th July last, stating in reply, that the "Commissioners would be prepared to give favourable consideration to any recommendations I might make for the appointment of monitors in pursuance of the plan I had sketched out." The plan then had the well considered approval of the managers of the schools, for I am perfectly certain if they, the nuns, had not well considered it, and had not the most complete confidence in Mr. Hanrahan, they would never have consented to his teaching the monitresses. It had also the approval of the Commissioners. Further, it had the approval of the parents of the monitors who are quite cognizant; so much so, that the father of a young girl, who was a candidate for a monitorship, sent her to the school and paid himself for her

instruction at it (whilst she still continued to attend the convent school during the ordinary school hours), in order that she might become the better qualified to obtain one of these appointments, or a teachership, whenever a vacancy might occur. I beg particular attention to this, as I shall have to refer to it in the sequel. All parties then concerned in the matter approve of it except Mr. Kavanagh. He stands alone in his opinion that the school is "fraught with moral danger." This is a singular and improper one to have expressed, as I think, where there were no grounds whatsoever before him of the truth of the assertion upon which he based it, namely, that the school is a mixed evening school. Now the fact of the matter is, it is not a mixed school, and it never was. From its first origin the boys and girls at it were kept separate, the former attending on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, and the latter on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, the alternate evenings being passed by the monitors at home re-writing their exercises from dictation after correction by the teacher, and preparing tasks, &c. All this appears distinctly in letters of mine forwarded to the office, and in my special report on it for the year 1856, sent up last (A.) Christmas. From the accompanying statement of Mr. Hanrahan, it appears that the only occasion upon which the boys and girls were brought together, was at the express order of Mr. Kavanagh himself. I feel quite as strongly as he possibly can, that it is desirable to keep young persons closely approaching or arrived at adolescence, of different sexes, in separate schools; but there is one very important difference between us, that I took every precaution to see this principle carried into practical effect in the Monitorial School whilst he disregarded it. I notice amongst the inaccuracies with which his letter abounds, that he states the ages of the monitors to vary from 14 to 18 years, whilst in reality they are from 11 to 18. In bringing the boys and girls together for examination he evidently acted contrary to the views he expresses against a mixed monitorial school (although no examination took place), and contrary also to those of the Commissioners, whose instructions to inspectors are, to hold the examinations of the monitors, boys and girls, on different days. It appears plain then, that Mr. Kavanagh does not attach any practical importance to the principle he enunciates of keeping them separated. And this extends also to his method of holding the annual examinations of teachers, as on these occasions here he assembles the men and women for examination at the same time in the one apartment. This course I always considered highly injudicious, and expressed to him my disapproval of it in 1856, and also in the present year. But as the details of these examinations are left, apparently, chiefly to the head inspector, I refrained from pressing my objections, and mention the matter now, only to show that Mr. Kavanagh does not in practice feel the necessity of keeping even adult teachers of different sexes separated.

Mr. Kavanagh objects to the master of the Wexford school being paid the gratuities for 12 monitors, asserting that there are but 19 in the district.

But I think it quite right and only just that he should be paid for these, seeing that he has given to them all the special instruction they require, under the sanction and with the warm approval of the managers and of their parents, and with the countenance of the Board. Although the total number of monitors in the district has nothing whatever to do with this, yet I must remark that Mr. Kavanagh has entirely mis-stated it, asserting it to be 19, when it is in point of fact 48.

Again, he says, "If the teacher of a school be not only able and willing, but also anxious to undertake the important charge of the entire instruction and training of a monitor, none should be appointed to the school."

It is evident he means the contrary of what he here states. He evidently meant to say that "If a teacher be unable or unwilling, or not anxious to undertake," &c. I shall reply to him as if he had said so. On this subject I must refer to Mr. Hanrahan's statement, who there plainly shows that he always taught all the monitors of the senior and junior departments of his school, which has a roll number for each, and that there is no other teacher in the town qualified and willing to perform the task he has undertaken, of giving all the 12 town monitors the special instruction they require. There is, therefore, evidently no injustice done to any one. The only teachers in the town are the nuns, and Messrs. Hanrahan and Scallan of the male school. The nuns are not prepared to devote any time after school hours to this work, but are very well pleased that Mr. Hanrahan should. Scallan is a third-class teacher, over the junior department,

department, and has to teach chiefly the first book. When a pupil of his can read the first book he is transferred to Mr. Hanrahan. Mr. Scallan is a very laborious, useful teacher, but certainly not qualified to instruct the monitors. Mr. Hanrahan then alone remains for attending to this. How much the nuns value his services appears from this, that the superioress of the Presentation Convent (Wexford Fem., No. 1) pays him at present from her own purse 8*l.* a year for teaching the fourth class of girls at an early hour in the morning, before the ordinary school hours. Under these circumstances Mr. Kavanagh would dismiss the eight monitresses in the convent schools and the two monitors in the junior department of the male school, and thus would leave schools having 917 pupils on the roll, on an average, without any monitorial staff—a course which I consider would be highly injudicious, and by all means to be avoided.

The next remark of Mr. Kavanagh's I have to deal with is as follows:—"Although this master (Mr. Hanrahan) may superintend and direct the literary studies of these boys and girls, it is clear that it is in their capacity as mere scholars, and not as monitors, as the teachers of their respective schools are the proper parties, who during the entire day direct and train them in the latter capacity."

Now it is not merely as ordinary literary pupils that the monitors are instructed. The course laid down by the Board for monitors is carefully followed, and they are instructed in methods of teaching, by means of model lessons, commencing with the first book and proceeding in order to the more advanced. This is done by forming the monitors present into a class, supposed for the time to be of pupils. Each has a lesson book and reads a portion of the lesson selected. The teacher then instructs and examines them upon it, keeping in view the requirements of the school programme. When this is done he selects one of the monitors to take his place as teacher, who examines and instructs the supposed class of pupils after this method, receiving from him all necessary hints and suggestions for his improvement. Surely this is special monitorial instruction, and not treating the monitors, as Mr. Kavanagh asserts, as "mere scholars."

When it is considered that there are on an average 1,053 pupils on the rolls of the town schools of Wexford in which the 12 monitors are placed, giving 87 pupils to each, it may be easily imagined how constantly they may be employed teaching the ordinary school hours, and consequently how necessary it is they should themselves be taught afterwards.

The only remaining passage of Mr. Kavanagh's letter, as far as regards the monitorial school, I have to notice, is a pleasant one. In it he says Mr. Hanrahan has been married within the last year or two. All I have to say on this fact is, that I would not have considered him eligible for the task of teaching the monitresses if he were not married. Mr. Kavanagh appears to be of the same opinion; the local managers, the nuns, are so too, although they said nothing concerning it to me; Mr. Hanrahan himself concurs. It is agreeable to find that, at least on this point, there is perfect unanimity amongst us all.

To conclude this subject, I have to say that accurate information on the nature and working of the monitorial school in all its details can be had from my special report on it for the year 1856, sent up last December.

2. Mr. Kavanagh's next statement is that "the appointment of monitors is highly injudicious as to locality." After detailing the schools in which they are placed, he finds that 14 out of the 19 examined are in the town of Wexford or its immediate vicinity, and concludes from this that a disproportionate number has been given to the town.

My answer to this is, that the selection of the monitors was made in accordance with the rule of the Board appointing them in schools which most required them from large attendance of pupils, and, as a general rule, where the teachers were sufficiently qualified to instruct them. The average attendance of pupils and the class of the teacher were duly returned by me with each recommendation, and the Board made the appointments with this information before them. The Commissioners gave no direction to distribute them in an equal manner over the different parts of the district; I might therefore, if I chose, stop here, and take no further notice of this objection. Wishing, however, to make my explanation as full as possible, I have to remark that it so happens that the monitors are very equally distributed locally in the way

Mr. Kavanagh seems to think is desirable. Not only has no undue number been given to Wexford, but the relative proportion of monitors in it at present is less than ever it was since the Board first appointed monitors. Formerly, under Mr. Bradford, the total number of monitors in the district was 12, and of these four, or one-third, were in the town. At present the number of monitors is 48, and of these 12, or one-fourth, only are in the town. Mr. Kavanagh is evidently ignorant of the fact that the number of monitors in the district is not, as he states, 19, but 48. He appears to labour also under the misapprehension that all the monitors were bound to attend the examinations, and finding that 19 attended, he concludes that it is the number in the district. Hence his mistake that there is an undue number in Wexford. So much for his accuracy in this, his objection to my proceedings in the matter of appointing monitors.

3. With regard to his next charge, that my examination of the monitors was "incomplete and unsatisfactory," I can show that it was not only quite complete according to what the Board required, but that even more was done than I was called on officially to do; and therefore, whether satisfactory or not in Mr. Kavanagh's opinion, it ought to be considered not only satisfactory by the Commissioners, but highly efficient.

The only monitors who were officially declared liable to attend the annual examination were those appointed previous to the 1st April 1856. Of the 19 who attended, 10 were appointed subsequent to this date, and these I permitted to attend chiefly for the purpose of accustoming them to the routine followed on these occasions, and that they might know practically what would be required of them, and be thus the better prepared for next year. Eight of these were in the Wexford Convent Schools, and two within a few miles of the town, so that they had no claim to travelling expenses, under the Board's rules, and thus there was no cost incurred by the Commissioners for their attendance; but the examination was rendered the more efficient, in so far as a larger number of monitors was brought under examination.

Again, he says, "The whole 19 should have been examined orally on at least lesson-books and arithmetic, and those of higher standing on other subjects, but this has been omitted."

Here he does not specify in how many cases this part of the examination was omitted, or what evidence he has to show that the omission was made in any. I have to say that the examination was carried on for three hours in the forenoon, by means of written exercises, on the printed questions sent from the office, and for three hours in the afternoon orally; and in that time the monitors were examined as fully as it was possible for one examiner to effect it, on the course laid down by the Board.

The following is the next assertion:—

"Seven of the 10 girls were not examined orally on the spelling-book or geography (except outline maps), nor on arithmetic or lesson-books, either orally or in writing, so that, so far as I know, the entire seven may be utterly ignorant of arithmetic and the matter of the lesson-books. The written exercises of these seven was confined to grammar and dictation"

I repeat that they were examined for three hours by written exercises, and for three hours orally on the course of study laid down by the Board. Writing from dictation was perhaps the very best test of their knowledge of spelling. As to what he says, that seven of the girls were not examined in geography, except on outline maps, I have to remark that if it were so, it was a very excellent method of ascertaining their geographical knowledge.

It is most inconsistent in Mr. Kavanagh to attempt to represent such a circumstance (if it occurred, which I doubt) as a defect in the examination. It comes with a peculiarly bad grace from him, for he concurs practically in my view of the matter, that such an examination may be efficient.

On a more important occasion, the examination of the female teachers for the purpose of classification, and that, too, when he could have devoted, if he so pleased, further time to the examination on geography, and having myself and Mr. Barrett assisting, he declared that the examination on the outline maps was sufficient.

This was at the examination held in February.

After I had asked the female teachers, 10 in number, 25 questions each on the outline maps, and noted their answers either as correct or otherwise, I inquired

inquired of Mr. Kavanagh should we go on with examination on the Geographical Text Book, and his answer was in the negative, and that it was not necessary.

I do not believe that the monitors were not examined on lesson books or arithmetic, either orally or in writing; in fact, this assertion is entirely unfounded. As far as it applies to the written examination, it is at once refuted by the fact, that all the printed questions were laid before the monitors. As to his statement, that, as far as he knows, seven of the ten girls may be utterly ignorant of arithmetic, and the matter of the lesson books, I have to say, that he showed no curiosity whatever when he was here, to ascertain, by examining them, if so lamentable a deficiency really existed. It is quite possible that the exercises of these seven were confined to grammar and writing from dictation; but they did all they could in the three hours allowed, and it would be quite absurd to expect much from them, as it was their first examination; they had been only four months appointed, and were for the most part junior monitors.

The next complaint is, "there were no dockets" for eight of the 10 girls, and I know nothing of their ages, standing, &c.

The supply of dockets sent from the office was not sufficient for these, and there was not time to write for more and receive them; but the dockets were not necessary, for these were monitors appointed subsequent to the 1st April 1856, and as such were not bound to attend the examinations; they wished, however, to do so, to become acquainted with its nature. I explained this in a letter sent with the exercises, stating that for the same reason the results of their oral answering was not as fully recorded as that of those bound to attend. If this letter were referred to Mr. Kavanagh, he should not have falsely argued that they were not examined on certain subjects, because he had not their answers on these recorded. It is certainly inconsiderate and unjust on his part to criticise what they were able to do, when, as he says himself, he knew "nothing of their age and standing."

4. Mr. Kavanagh next gives a tabular statement, which he wrongly calls a "Summary of the results of the examinations." I find it necessary for the better understanding of the points at which we are at issue, to give it *in extenso*.

Copy of Mr. Kavanagh's Tabular Statement.

No.	School.	Monitor.	Age.	Date of Appointment.	Recommendation.
1	Lady's Island -	James Lambert -	17	5/53	Remove him; no gratuity.
2	Enniscorthy - -	A. P. Long - -	17	1/54	3d year's gratuity.
3	Piercestown - -	James Leary -	16	7/54	Depress one year; no gratuity.
4	Newtownbarry -	M. Cowman - -	17	10/54	3d year's gratuity.
5	Ferns - - -	P. M'Donald -	16	10/54	Depress one year; no gratuity.
6	Wexford, No. 1 -	M. Connor - -	18	2/55	1st year's gratuity.
7	- - ditto - -	John Pierce - -	14	7/56	Remove him; no gratuity.
8	- - ditto - -	John Byrne - -	16	4/55	Fine 10*s*. Gratuity (1st year) to James Scallan, master of school.
9	Castlebridge -	Thomas Barron -	14	8/56	Remove him; no gratuity.
10	Kilturk Female -	M. Smith -	15	7/55	Gratuity of 1st year.
11	Wexford Fem., No. 2	Eliza Power -	15	7/56	- ditto - ditto.
12	- - ditto - -	Margaret Codd -	–	- -	Quite unfit; remove them.
13	- - ditto - -	M. A. Murphy -	–	- -	
14	- - ditto - -	Margaret Arkinson	–	- -	
15	- - ditto - -	Kate Wickham -	–	- -	

The four last are quite unfit, so far as I can judge, from the extent of the examination submitted to me; the last two are junior monitors. The other four of the monitresses are in the Wexford Female No. 1 School:

16	- - - -	Ellen Roche -	All quite unfit. No particulars as to their ages.
17	- - - -	Margaret Hinds -	
18	- - - -	Maria Brophy -	
19	- - - -	Anastatia M'Evoy	

Now this is not a "Summary of the results of the examinations," for it gives no particulars whatever as to the answering of the monitors; it merely specifies their names, ages, dates of appointment, and Mr. Kavanagh's recommendations. For these he assigns no reasons. He does not give the particular defects for which he recommends so many to be dismissed as "quite unfit." As I concur with him in some cases, but differ from him in others, I shall go into each in detail, quoting his remarks as I proceed.

"No. 1. James Lambert, Lady's Island. Remove him." This is my own recommendation, as entered on the examination docket sent up last November. I specified the 31st December as the date from which he should be removed, but this has not been done up to this. It is now not worth while to act upon it, as Lambert's term of service, four years, expires next month, and he will then be discontinued.

The recommendations on Nos. 2 and 4 are the same as those entered by me on the dockets, that the teachers should receive the regular gratuities; Nos. 3 and 5, "Depress one year; no gratuity."

The latter part of this, that the teachers should receive no gratuity, I concur in entirely, and I entered it on the dockets; but I do not clearly understand what is meant by "Depress one year." If it be, that the monitor is to be considered in all respects of the previous year's standing, he will then serve five years in all as monitor, instead of four, and will thus receive the more money. To many this would be not a punishment, but a reward.

No. 6. "Martin Connor, Wexford M. No. 1. Appointed February 1855. First year's gratuity."

I object to this; Mr. Hanrahan is, in my opinion, entitled to the full gratuity for this lad's instruction. I have recommended the usual gratuity on the docket in this case, which is of the second year.

No. 8. "John Byrne, Wexford, made No. 2, appointed April 1855. Fine 10*s*. Gratuity of first year to J. Scallan, master of school."

It is not stated for what he should be fined. I made the recommendation on the docket that he should be fined in this sum for neglect of personal neatness after repeated warnings. He has, with the other monitors of the town, been taught, not by Mr. Scallan, but by Mr. Hanrahan, who is evidently entitled to a gratuity; and not, as I think, to one of the first year, but to that of the second.

No. 10. "Mary Smith, Kilturk Female N. S., appointed July 1855. Gratuity of first year."

This monitress was in her second year at the time of the examination, and I submit the teacher ought to be paid the gratuity laid down in the Board's regulations for the second year. She has taken much pains with the monitress, and is highly qualified to instruct her, being the best schoolmistress in the district, and ranking first class, first division.

No. 11. "Gratuity." Eliza Power. I concur in this, if it be meant that the teacher of the Wexford N. S., No. 1, receive it, as she attends his monitorial class.

I now come to the recommendations for dismissal, 10 in number, of which I totally disapprove.

No. 7. "John Pierce, Wexford Male N. S., No. 1, appointed July 1856. Remove him; no gratuity."

This I object to; the lad is a most promising monitor, and Mr. Kavanagh himself said so to me when in Wexford, and told himself he was "a good boy, and had an honest face." I recommended, on the docket, that Mr. Hanrahan should receive the regular gratuity for his instruction, that of the first year.

Nos. 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19:—"Remove him; no gratuity." "Quite unfit; remove them." "All quite unfit; no particulars as to their ages;" and in the body of his letter is the following remark: "I know nothing of their age, standing," &c.

Now it occurs to me that it would be much better if Mr. Kavanagh, before recommending

recommending these eight girls to be dismissed, had obtained this information, which appears to me such as should be known to him, previous to adopting such a course.

One of these monitresses is a classed teacher now, as will appear shortly; and the others, including Pierce, No. 7 (in all, 10), Mr. Kavanagh recommends to be dismissed. I object to this entirely; firstly, because, having been appointed subsequent to April 1856, they were not liable to be judged on the examination, which they were not bound to attend, by the Board's regulations, and to which they came voluntarily, in order to accustom themselves to the routine. This routine is, in a much greater degree than an inexperienced person can imagine, both difficult and embarrassing to young persons like them, who present themselves, for the first time in their lives, to what they consider a most momentous and trying ordeal. I pointed this out in a letter accompanying the monitors' exercises, and which was, or should have been, before Mr. Kavanagh with these papers. If it were, he should not, I submit, have recommended their dismissal; but whether or not, the Board will not, I trust, attend to his recommendations in their cases.

Secondly. Of those monitresses recommended by Mr. Kavanagh to be dismissed as "quite unfit," and who came thus to the examination with the object stated in view, there is one, Margaret Codd (No. 12), whose case I wish to notice particularly. She is the girl alluded to in my remarks on the Monitorial School, whose father sent her to it, and paid for her instruction at it 5 *s.* a quarter. She acted as monitress in the Wexford Female School (No. 2), but was not paid by the Board. She was only a candidate monitress, waiting for the next vacancy. She is amongst those to whom he applies the remark, "Quite unfit; remove them;" for after the following names of monitresses in the tabular statement, No. 12, Margaret Codd; No. 13, Mary Anne Murphy; No. 14, Margaret Arkinson; No. 15, Kate Wickham, it will be seen he adds, "the four last are quite unfit, so far as I can judge from the extent of the examination submitted to me." And opposite their names are the words, "Quite unfit; remove them." On this I have to say, that the first-mentioned of the four (Margaret Codd) was appointed teacher of the Castlebridge Female National School subsequent to the monitorial examination, and being in charge of it at the time of the teachers' annual examination for 1856, held on the 5th and 6th February last, was duly summoned to attend, and during examination by Mr. Kavanagh was praised by him for her answering, and by himself, *proprio motu*, recommended, on the classification being made, for promotion to the third class of teachers. The written exercises alone could not possibly furnish him with sufficient data for coming to the conclusion that a monitor was quite unfit, and should be dismissed. Margaret Codd was the only girl attending the monitorial school he examined orally, on his coming to Wexford, and he promoted her, even as a teacher, instead of dismissing her as a monitress. He was not aware she had been attending the Monitorial School until she had been examined, and her promotion agreed upon. This fact I took particular care he should not know sooner, in consequence of his loud disapprobation, already expressed, of my monitorial arrangements. I thought it a good and fair way of testing his accuracy that he should have an opportunity of examining one of the monitresses without knowing she was such. It now appears that this one he had already declared to be "quite unfit," as three months only had elapsed from the holding of the monitorial examinations, on which he recommended her dismissal, and the holding of the teachers' examinations, at which he had her promoted. The inconsistency between the two proceedings cannot, in my opinion, be accounted for by supposing that she made extraordinarily great progress in the interim, although she undoubtedly did make a good deal. But there is too wide a difference between a monitress deserving of dismissal as "quite unfit," and a teacher found deserving of third class, and that without serving the usual probationary year, to admit of this supposition. He must have been mistaken in her case, and I believe firmly he is so in the others.

He does not say what any of the monitresses either knows or does not know, nor does he assign any reason whatever, as already stated, for his recommendations of dismissal beyond the mere dictum, "Quite unfit; remove them."

I shall mention what Ellen Roche knows, another of those declared by him to be "quite unfit," without having seen them, and, as he says himself, without knowing their age or standing. She reads with entire ease and fluency; can

read any of the poetical pieces in blank verse of the fourth book with accuracy, ease, and expression; has a good accent and correct pronunciation; has a tolerable knowledge of grammar, can parse ordinary sentences, and has worked and knows all the compound rules of arithmetic; knows the maps of the world and Europe; writes a good hand, writes fairly from dictation; has a knowledge of needlework. She is a senior monitress of the first year, having been selected by me last July, and is 14 years of age.

Mr. Kavanagh thinks proper to report her as "quite unfit," and to order her dismissal. If this be correct, all the monitors in the Wexford district, and all the monitors and teachers in the entire kingdom are "quite unfit," and ought also to be dismissed. If this be done, I feel quite sure no fitter persons can be got to succeed them. All the national schools in Ireland, as well as the Wexford Monitorial School, will be permanently broken up, and then there will be no further necessity for inspectors or other officers of the Board; they will become useless, and may properly be dismissed too, and, indeed, the Board itself may be dissolved.

But I believe all the other monitors appointed subsequent to the 1st of April 1856 to be, as well as Margaret Codd and Ellen Roche, well qualified and quite fit for their positions, and that Mr. Kavanagh would have found them so had he examined them. Why did he not? I cannot say. It was of importance he should. He had ample time to do so. The monitors were assembled at one o'clock on Friday the 6th of February for the purpose, by his own orders and appointment; they waited on him for more than three hours, and it was but a quarter past four o'clock when they were brought in before us. One, only one, Kate Wickham, a junior monitress, was heard to read a few sentences. She read extremely well. Mr. Kavanagh had already declared her, in his letter of the 21st January, to be "quite unfit," and had said, "remove her." Nothing further was done, although all was ready for the examination. The necessary books were on the table; Mr. Hanrahan, the teacher, was in attendance to give any explanations that might be required. The monitors were suddenly sent away, after being only a quarter of an hour before us; and it was for this they had been kept waiting for three hours and a quarter.

Well, although Mr. Kavanagh would not examine them, he seemed nevertheless much pleased with them. Their appearance was remarkably neat and respectable. He spoke encouragingly to them of their future success in their chosen occupation as teachers, hoped to have the pleasure of meeting them again in Wexford, and to find them progressing, &c. &c.

Now, if there were a person present aware that he had written a letter to the Board recommending by far the greater number of these girls before us to be dismissed as "quite unfit," and he had said to him, "Surely, Mr. Kavanagh, you cannot be serious; surely you cannot sincerely entertain the bright hopes of these young persons' future career you have expressed just now, for you have already done all in your power to blight their prospects; you have, but a fortnight since, put in writing to the Board your deliberate opinion of their total unfitness, and appear to have taken upon yourself to order the Commissioners to dismiss them. The words of your letter, addressed to the Commissioners through their secretaries, concerning these monitresses are, 'they are quite unfit; remove them.' The district inspector has told you they are 'quite fit,' but you are resolved to hold to your letter. You are determined to dismiss them; for, although they have been attending upon you for two days at your own order and appointment, and after having awaited admission to your presence to-day for more than three hours, when they are now before you, you will not examine them. Notwithstanding all this, you now tell them that you entertain good hopes of their prospects in life as teachers, and endeavour to persuade them that you take an interest in their welfare, and that you are their friend. Come, Mr. Kavanagh, let us hear your explanation." What explanation, I say, could he attempt to give in reply to such observations as these?

Thirdly. I think Mr. Kavanagh has adopted an unusual and irregular course in declaring paid monitors to be "quite unfit," and recommending them to be dismissed on examination of their written exercises only, without examining them orally, or even seeing them, and without consulting the district inspector in any way as to their merits.

In

In the perfectly analogous case of the examination of teachers, the dismissal or promotion, &c., of these is made to depend on the joint recommendation of the head and district inspectors; and a similar mode of proceeding appears to have been provided for in the case of monitors, by printing on the monitors' examination dockets a form of certificate to be signed by both. These certificates I filled up for all the monitors liable to examination, signed them, and sent them with the exercises. I submit that Mr. Kavanagh, if he dissented from any of the recommendations contained in these, should have communicated with me on the subject, instead of undertaking, on his sole authority, to recommend dismissals of monitors whom he had never seen, and these so numerous, as to involve the virtual breaking up of the whole corps of monitors in this town, having to assist in the instruction of upwards of 1,000 children.

He had clearly no right to change the amounts of the gratuities without my consent or knowledge; for, in your circular letter of the 4th July last, it is stated that the amount of gratuity in each case is to be awarded only on the joint recommendation of the head and district inspectors. I cannot say whether he ever sent into the office the certificates bearing my signatures, but these appeared to me to be prepared for that purpose, and to have the teachers paid the gratuities on them.

If a classification sheet were prepared for the monitors, and containing certificates for the gratuities to be filled up after each annual examination, and to be signed both by the head and district inspectors, the chances would be very materially diminished of any such difference of opinion as now exists between Mr. Kavanagh and myself coming under the notice of the official authorities.

I have now done. This letter may appear lengthened, but I have made it as brief as was consistent with noticing every point that required attention, and I feel that it does not contain an unnecessary word.

I have, &c.

The Secretaries, Education Office. (signed) *Henry P. Clarke.*

(A.)

Sir, Wexford National Schools, February 1857.

As I have acted on your instructions in the conduct of the Wexford Monitorial School, and in the course of instruction pursued in all particulars, I think it incumbent upon me to inform you of the very unfavourable views which Mr. Kavanagh, Head Inspector of National Schools, has expressed to me regarding it.

On the 3d of February, I received a note from Mr. Kavanagh, requesting me to have the monitors of both sexes in attendance, as he wished to see the monitorial or evening school in operation on the following day, the 4th. It was unusual, and, in fact, never occurred before to bring the monitors of both sexes together in the school, as I was most careful, in obedience to your express directions, to teach the boys and girls on alternate days only. Fearing, therefore, that you might be displeased if they were brought together, although I had them all in attendance, I had the boys in the lower school-room and the girls above stairs.

Mr. Kavanagh arrived about half-past four o'clock, and remained only a few moments. Immediately on his arrival he ordered the boys and girls to be brought into the same room, which I obeyed at once. He did not examine the children in any branch of instruction, but called the roll, inquired their ages, and dismissed them, telling them all to meet him there to examine them at one o'clock on Friday, mentioning to the girls to obtain permission from the ladies of the convents to do so, adding that they all knew him very well, and he had no doubt they would allow it. On that day and hour they were in punctual attendance, both boys and girls, as before. He could not, however, examine them according to his appointment, as the examination of the female teachers was proceeding. They were allowed then to remain (the girls in a private apartment of my own, and the boys on the stairs, the school-rooms being occupied by the teachers under examination) until three o'clock, when I considered it my duty to inform him that they were all in attendance upon him according

to his orders, and that they were anxious to go to dinner, as they were in the habit of getting it about that hour, and to know if they might go away for this purpose; and if so, that they would return in a short time. He desired that they should stay until four o'clock, when he would see them; and if he could not see them, then they might go home. At a quarter past four they were sent for, the girls being on this occasion brought in first and the boys subsequently, after the girls had left. You yourself, sir, know what then occurred; only one little girl, Kate Wickham, a junior monitor, was examined, and the examination consisted in requesting her to read a few sentences from one of the lesson books, which I take the liberty of saying she did remarkably well. Mr. Kavanagh and yourself had also the kindness to ask the class generally a few questions in Scripture history. The boys were not examined at all. All was over about half past four o'clock, and the monitors were dismissed to their homes.

On several occasions between Mr. Kavanagh's arrival and Friday evening, the 6th, he expressed very strong disapprobation indeed to me of having all the monitors of the town placed under my tuition, as it was an injustice to the teachers of the national schools to which they were appointed not to receive the gratuities promised by the Board for their special instruction. To this I replied by stating the fact, of which you, sir, are well aware, that there is no other teacher but myself under the Board in this town qualified and willing to instruct them, and that there is no injustice done, therefore, to any one in the matter. This school is the only male national school in the town; for, although it has two separate roll numbers, it is really but one school, consisting of a junior and senior department, the children learning the first book being taught in the lower room, and those more advanced up stairs. I have always taught the monitors of both rooms ever since monitors were appointed to them under Mr. Bradford, and also under yourself long before the Board came to the determination of paying teachers for such special instruction. As to the two remaining national schools, they are held in the Presentation Convent and the Convent of Mercy, and as you, sir, know well, the nuns would not and could not give the monitors the special instruction which they receive from me; they could only be taught the ordinary lessons with the other pupils during the usual school hours. The ladies of the convents are occupied with devotional exercises or in other ways after school hours, and could not attend to the monitors after their dismissal from school. I can confidently say that the arrangements under which I have acted meet, not only with the fullest approbation, but with the warmest approval of the superioresses of those establishments. Previous to those arrangements having been made by you, sir, I attended the Presentation Convent to teach the monitors and some of the pupils of the fourth class outside of the ordinary school hours, and was paid by Mrs. Butler, the mother-abbess, from her own private purse. I was also asked by the rev. mother of the Convent of Mercy to attend there in the same way, but was unable to do so for want of time. If then the Monitorial School is discontinued, the only difference it will make, as far as these establishments are concerned, is that the monitors will be separated under instruction, and will thereby lose that stimulus to exertion which every one who is acquainted with school teaching knows is produced by having several taught together, and that those ladies will have a much higher amount to pay to a competent teacher than what is awarded to me from the Board.

I thought the paramount objects of the Board in appointing paid monitors and fixing a scale of remuneration to the teachers were, that they might be of service in assisting in large schools where most required, and that they should be properly instructed in a specific course, with a view to qualifying them to become efficient teachers hereafter, and that whoever was best qualified, and could give time also to such a task, would be the person most desirable to place in charge of their instruction.

To these remarks Mr. Kavanagh replied that he had no objection to me personally as to my qualifications; that, on the contrary, he thought me a very fit person to be entrusted with such an important charge. This, I think, he repeated again in the presence of you and Mr. Barrett, but his objections remained unchanged on the grounds before expressed, and for those reasons "he could not tolerate such a proceeding," and that it would meet with his most strenuous opposition.

Further, he stated that he objected to female monitors attending a male school

school for instruction, to which I replied that the only time the male and female monitors were ever brought together was the present, at his own special request, and that you, sir, had expressly forbidden me on any pretext whatsoever to allow them to meet at school. I was much disappointed Mr. Kavanagh was unable, from pressure of business, to examine the monitors, and pained to find that he condemned the whole proceeding, without having an opportunity of testing its usefulness by any examination. This seemed the more strange to me as he, on the occasion of his several visits to Wexford, expressed before the teachers assembled, and on the last occasion in the presence of my patron, the Rev. Mr. Roche, his opinion of me in very flattering terms. He also said, in the presence of yourself, sir, and Mr. Barrett, that in his letter to the Commissioners he expressed his opinions of me in a way that would do me no discredit. This, in my opinion, seems strangely at variance with his determination to recommend the suppression of the Monitorial School, so well calculated on several accounts to be beneficial to the monitors, and ultimately to produce teachers better qualified than they would otherwise become without doing wrong to any teacher to whose schools they have been appointed as before stated.

I have now given a plain and exact narrative, according to your request, of everything that occurred respecting the success of the Monitorial School in which you take so warm an interest.

I beg to remain, &c.

H. P. Clarke, Esq., (signed) *Patrick Hanrahan.*
Inspector of National Schools.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 29 April 1857.

I HAVE heard from several persons that there has been lying in the office for some time past a letter from Mr. Clarke in reference to my report, dated January 21st last, upon the paid monitors of his district.

Rumour informs me that much importance is attached to this letter, but I would most respectfully suggest that instead of making any such communication the subject of general comment, much less arriving at a foregone conclusion in reference to its moral value, it should, at the earliest convenient period, be submitted to me for my remarks or explanation.

I remain, &c.

The Secretaries, Education Office. (signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 4 May 1857.

I BEG leave to request that you will lay before the Commissioners of National Education at their next meeting the following explanation respecting their order, dated the 1st instant, in reference to my letter of the 29th ultimo, on the subject of Mr. H. P. Clarke's reply to a report of mine on the paid monitors of the Wexford district.

In that order, communicated by your letter of the 2d instant, it is stated, "the attention of the Commissioners has been drawn to the following extract from your letter (dated 29th April) : 'I would most respectfully suggest that instead of making any such communication (*i. e.* Mr. Clarke's) the subject of general comment, much less arriving at a foregone conclusion in reference to its moral value, it should at the earliest convenient period be submitted to me for my remarks or explanation.'" Upon this extract the following decision in the same order is founded: "The Commissioners object exceedingly to the tone of your communication of the 29th April. They consider it undutiful and unbecoming in you to assume that they would suffer the case to be prejudged against you without enabling you to offer the fullest explanation respecting any remarks unfavourable to your character that have been made by Mr. Clarke, in the answer drawn up by him in reply to your (my) charges of 21st January last."

In reference to this decision I beg leave to state, that the drift of my letter of the 29th ultimo has evidently been wholly misapprehended by the Commissioners, and that I never meant to assume, nor did I feel any apprehension, that they would suffer the case to be prejudged as described. I merely wished to convey to you that this letter had been lying in the office for a long time, considering the nature of the communication; that I had been spoken to by many in reference to its

its nature and import, and that to silence rumour it would be desirable to have it sent to me for explanation without further delay.

I never felt towards the Commissioners as you describe; no reference to them, explicitly or implicitly, occurs in my letter, and the extract quoted to sustain the view put forward is partial, as the first part of the sentence, and that which affords the key to my meaning, is omitted; thus, "rumour informs me that much importance is attached to this letter, but," and it is only after this that the passage quoted on last page commences, instead of giving the whole sentence.

Although a deep wrong has been done towards me, yet I feel that if it appears to the Commissioners there was reasonable ground, in the want of clearness and precision in the one sentence in my letter, to come to such a conclusion as that adverted to, I can only express my sincere regret; but that I entertained no such sentiments as those referred to me is known to many persons.

I have, &c.

The Secretaries, Education Office. (signed) *J. W. Kavanagh.*

(B. O., 8/5/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 13 May 1857.

The Commissioners of National Education have had before them your letter of the 4th instant, in answer to our communication of the 2d, conveying a Board's order made on a previous letter of yours concerning Mr. Clarke's reply to your complaint of him as an Inspector of National Schools. In the letter referred to (4th) you make the following observation:

> "In reference to this decision, I beg leave to state that the drift of my letter of the 29th ult. has evidently been wholly misapprehended by the Commissioners, and that I never meant to assume, nor did I feel any apprehension, that they would suffer the case to be prejudged as described. I merely wished to convey to you that this letter has been lying in the office for a long time, considering the nature of the communication; that I had been spoken to by many in reference to its nature and import, and that to silence rumour it would be desirable to have it sent to me for explanation without further delay."

We are directed to inform you, that in the unanimous opinion of the Commissioners your explanation is by no means satisfactory; and they hereby require, that you will in future be more guarded in your official correspondence, and abstain from making any comments on the acts of the Board or of their officers, unless in so far as it may come within the sphere of your legitimate duties as Head Inspector.

We are further to inform you that the consideration of your letter in reference to your weekly lectures to the teachers of the North Dublin District, has been deferred to the next day of meeting.

We are, &c.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq. (signed) *Maurice Cross,* *James Kelly,* } Secretaries.

Sir, Education Office, 25 July 1857.

We are to remind you of our letter of the 4th of May last, forwarding you a copy of Mr. Clarke's answers to certain statements made by you in your communication of the 21st January last, and have to request that you will forward, without further delay, any explanation you may have to offer.

We are, &c.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq. (signed) *Maurice Cross,* *James Kelly,* } Secretaries.

(Dist. 40.)

Mr. *Kavanagh*'s Remarks upon Mr. *H. P. Clarke*'s Letter of 11 March 1857, in reply to Mr. *Kavanagh*'s Report of January 21, upon the Monitors of the *Wexford* District.

Gentlemen,

Mr. Clarke's letter of March 11th last, in reply to my Report of January 21st upon the paid monitors of the Wexford District, reached me in Claremorris, May 10th, and other duties and circumstances prevented me from replying to Mr. Clarke's remarks previous to this date.

This letter, or report, of January 21st, upon Mr. Clarke's monitors, was forwarded as part of a prescribed routine duty, and any peculiarity in it arose wholly from the novel circumstances of the case. The reports upon six districts had been forwarded previous to that upon Mr. Clarke's; those upon two others were sent in next day after that upon his, and the tenth report was delayed owing to inspector's (Mr. Mahony's) retention of his monitors' papers.

I think it necessary here, at the outset, to remind you that the question to increase the number of paid monitors, and also to introduce junior monitors, had been under discussion for many years by the head inspectors; and that the latter portion of the scheme was strongly opposed by Messrs. Butler and M'Creedy, whilst from the first it had my active support until carried. Scarcely had the measure been promulgated, when its action was suspended by the Board in the autumn of last year.

The examination of the paid monitors for 1856 was the first instance in which the head inspectors were brought into immediate connexion with the decision of the qualifications, &c., of these young persons, and with the awarding of gratuities to the teachers under whom they serve.

If the arrangements had been specially designed, which I am sure they were not, to produce a large amount of contention between head and district inspectors, between the office and inspectors, and between managers and teachers on the one side, against the Board's officers on the other, they could not be more successful than they have already been; and this in one year's working of the measure. This result was evident beforehand, and in the very first summary of the examinations sent in, that for District 35, January 3d last, I stated, "I beg to observe that the entire procedure and operation of the monitorial question require early consideration," and this same opinion forms the substance of the last paragraph of my letter of January 21st upon the examination of Mr. Clarke's monitors.

It may also be necessary to state that in several instances, as well as in Mr. Clarke's cases, I was obliged to differ in opinion with the district inspectors, sometimes as to the retention of monitors in office, sometimes as to the amount of gratuity to be awarded to the teachers under whom they served, and sometimes upon both these grounds. The cases of 99 monitors came before me, and I was obliged to recommend the removal of 20 as not qualified; that others should be retained on trial only, and that the teachers of about 40 of them should be denied a gratuity for their instruction. In 6 of the 10 districts I recommended some to be removed, and in 8 of the 10 I recommended that gratuities be refused. Of 19 monitors in Mr. Conwell's district, 5 were noted by me for removal, and others for admonition; in Mr. Clarke's district, 9 of 19 were noted for removal; in the former gratuities were refused in 10 cases, and in the latter in 12.

On sending in my recommendation in the case of Mr. Clarke's monitors, I felt it my duty to notice the following points in reference to that district:—

1st. That the appointment of the monitors is highly injudicious as to locality.

2d. That the examination of the monitors by Mr. Clarke was incomplete and unsatisfactory.

3d. That the recommendation of Mr. Clarke to have the gratuities pertaining to the monitors employed in four schools, paid to the teacher of one of these schools, is wrong in principle, and otherwise objectionable.

4th. That I differed with him in opinion as to the recommendations in some of the 19 cases of salaries and gratuities.

March 11th, Mr. Clarke states that I have "mixed these subjects somewhat confusedly together," whereas they are treated of, in my letter of January 21st,

under numbered heads as above, and copied therefrom by Mr. Clarke, but not in that order. I shall deal with each subject as it occurs in my letter, and notice under each such matters pertinent thereto as Mr. Clarke has brought forward.

1st. Distribution of monitors over the district.

Returns reached me of 19 monitors only. I was fully aware that none were required to attend the examination held last winter except those appointed previous to April 1st, 1856, but finding that only eight belonged to that class, and that of the other 11 there were very many of them who had been appointed only a few months, and one whose appointment was not ratified, I naturally concluded that this was the entire monitorial staff of the district. Under this view I protested against the allocation of 14 of these to the town and suburbs of Wexford, and only five to all the suburbs in the rest of the district. In the absence of a list of all the monitors employed in the district, I was unable to know the precise number. The order of the Board to appoint junior monitors was cancelled soon after its issue; in only three of the districts were over 10 monitors examined, and all these, coupled with the statement above made, led me to conclude that 19 formed the entire staff. Even with 48, as I learned in a few days after the date of my letter when I visited Wexford, the abuse is lessened in degree only; as to assign 12 or 14 of these to one town in the district is decidedly objectionable. It is very remarkable too, that a town should be selected for the training of 12 monitors, three of the four schools in it being unsuitable, as Mr. Clarke states, for the purpose. Wexford town contains only a twelfth of the population of the district, not one-twentieth of the number of schools, and far from one-fourth of the number of pupils.

Under this head I may notice that it is only by mere chance we could expect successful appointments through the means resorted to by Mr. Clarke. He printed a circular and sent it round to the managers of all the schools having an average daily attendance of 35 pupils under a teacher classed 3, informing them that their schools were each entitled to a junior monitor, and inviting them to send in candidates for the monitorships. In this manner all, or nearly all, the junior monitors were selected. Now the very first condition, and by far the most important one, required by the Board's circular, was practically set aside, viz., "That the selection should be made from those who have manifested an aptitude for teaching." It may be said that the teacher's recommendation to the manager might stand instead of the inspector's own personal experience; but this apology can have little weight with experienced inspectors. When you consider the dates, so long before the examination of the monitors, of Mr. Clarke's visits to the schools, and when you find his note books perfectly blank as to the details of the answering, aptitude for teaching, &c., of a single pupil examined in 81 visits to schools (*see* my letter* of April 10th last), can there be any doubt that he had little or no knowledge of the aptitude for teaching of the candidates, but that he selected them on the grounds of scholarship alone, and hoped for the aptitude for teaching? Next, when we see the few visits paid to these schools by him since the appointment of these young persons, we cannot doubt that, beyond having examined them, the inspector knows very little of them as monitors in the schools where they act. It is while going round the schools, and observing the boys of promise in the classes, and such as act as unpaid monitors, that an active and able inspector meets the recruits; upon these he keeps his eye, and these he notes for monitorships when vacancies occur. This Mr. Clarke did not do; he appointed them first from those presented by the managers, and he hopes whenever he visits to find them show the necessary aptitude.

2d. Mr. Clarke's examination of the monitors was incomplete and unsatisfactory.

In reference to my remarks under this head, Mr. Clarke states that he had 10 of the 19 monitors under examination who were not liable to be summoned, and that this "larger number rendered the examination more effective," although he pleads want of time to examine on some of the subjects omitted by him. Surely had he called in only the proper parties, nine, the time would have been ample

* Written a month before I received Mr. Clarke's letter of March 11th last.

ample to get through the duty in the manner required. Mr. Clarke appears to lose sight altogether of the fact that whether the monitors were bound to attend or not, if, on their answering, &c., coming before me I am of opinion that they are not qualified in the entrance course for monitors, it is manifestly my duty to report the matter to the Board and recommend their removal. Why did Mr. Clarke summon them, interfering as it did with the proper examination of those bound to attend? Why unnecessarily double the number, and thus reduce by one-half the efficiency of the examination, time being limited? Why send up the written exercises of the 10 not bound to attend; or why the office send them to me for my opinion and recommendation?

Every statement made by me as to the short-comings of the examination is strictly accurate, and is drawn exclusively, as I had no other source of information, from Mr. Clarke's own returns. These were, the monitors' written exercises, Mr. Clarke's abstract of the oral examination as sent to me, and his summary of same on the backs of the dockets. The girls Murphy, Atkinson, Wickham, Roche, Hinds, Brophy, and M'Evoy, seven of the 19, were not examined in geography, lesson books, or arithmetic by written papers; at least I must presume so when their exercises thereon are not sent, although those by them on grammar and on dictation were forwarded to me. These same seven were not examined orally upon either arithmetic or lesson books, so that, so far as I know, they may have been then wholly ignorant of at least these two subjects. It is remarkable also that a candidate, but not a recognised monitress, Codd, should have been examined fully, at least to the extent of those of highest standing, whilst the above seven girls, all of whom were regularly appointed, and one of them, Roche, a senior monitress, were not. Codd's qualifications were satisfactory; those of the others were not.

Mr. Clarke affects to contradict some of the details set forth by me by asking upon what evidence this, that, and the other statement is made; he knows full well that it is upon his alone. There is not a single fact set forth by me respecting the details of the examination, but is drawn from his own returns, and can be verified therefrom. The backs of the 11 dockets in the office, which were filled by Mr. Clarke himself, will afford proof of the accuracy of my statements, and herewith I send the written exercises of all the monitors, as also other returns from Mr. Clarke, to overwhelm him with proofs of the accuracy of my statements, which he well knew were drawn from his own official documents. His answer as to want of time to examine further is much weakened for the following reasons: 1st. Had he called in the nine only, who were obliged to attend the examination instead of 19, the time would have been ample; and, 2d. When he did call them in, as eight of the 10 others lived in the town and two near it, an efficient, anxious officer would have either extended the time of the oral examination in the evening beyond three hours, or have examined these 10 next day. Mr. Conwell had 19 monitors, and their examination is made complete in every particular; Mr. Adair, Mr. Coyle, 12, &c., and no officer connected with me left so much undone as Mr. Clarke;* indeed few left any subject of the course untouched.

3d. The recommendation to award to Mr. Hanrahan, master of one of the Wexford schools, the gratuities for the instruction of not only the two monitors employed under himself, but also for 10 others employed in three other national schools in the town, is wrong in principle, and opposed to the regulations in reference to monitors.

My objection to this pet scheme of Mr. Clarke's, one upon which he takes credit for the occupation of so much of his official time, and which is the object of so large a share of his anxiety, is the chief cause of the present controversy about the paid monitors. Eight of these girls are employed in the two convent schools in the town of Wexford; now, I say, if the ladies of those convent schools are either unable, unwilling, or both, to undertake the direction of these girls in the prescribed course of study, deny them the aid of monitresses, and treat these like all other national schools. It is clear (page 2, Mr. C.'s letter), that this novel scheme originated with Mr. Clarke; he canvassed the heads of the convents for their support of it; and then he puts the matter before the Board

* See returns herewith.

Board for their approbation. Mr. Clarke and others, I am sorry to observe, quite forget that it can never have been seriously contemplated (no matter what countenance the wording of rules or of circulars may give to the contrary), that the monitors of any grade should devote the whole of the school-hours to actual teaching in the school; and to thus employ a junior monitor from the moment of his appointment would be so utterly absurd, that better the whole monitorial scheme had never been started. A monitor is simply a pupil whose services the teacher may command for a reasonable time in the day to assist in some of the classes; during the remainder of the day he stands in his own class and shares in its course of instruction. When first appointed pupil, age should be the rule, monitorial occupation the exception; and gradually these should so vary with his increased years, standing, and proficiency, that towards the close of his senior service as a monitor, teaching should be the chief, and pupilage the less occupation of his schoolhours. It is a burlesque upon all rational notions of education to suddenly take a child, of 11 years of age, in third class, and turn it into a six-hours-a-day teacher, from that until it is 18 or 19 years of age, while passing through the junior and senior grades of monitorship. To supplement a sort of rate-in-aid to this preposterous scheme, it is proposed that the young people of that class in the whole town (12 in all) shall get about three hours' special instruction in each week, not in their own schools (with one exception) or from their own teachers, but from another teacher, who is to get the award of the emolument and the honour due, wholly, or at least mainly, to those who should direct and instruct them, not three hours a week, but five to six hours a day. In her own school and in her own class is the proper place to instruct each of these girls; some of them were children of 10 or 11 years of age. Some of these cannot distinguish the parts of speech;* hardly any of the girls succeeded in parsing a very simple sentence. The penmanship of some is very bad, and the orthography horrid. Of the qualifications of seven of them I am ignorant, beyond these three subjects, and also reading; but in these they are not equal to senior third-class girls. A glance over the mis-spelled words in the margin† will afford some idea, in this essential branch, of the gross ignorance of seven of the girls, who wrote two exercises only, grammar and dictation. The fewest errors, amongst few words, amounted to 15, and thence up to 36; the average number to each of the seven monitors being 23 errors, capital letters, omitted words, &c., exclusive. How, may I ask, could any man, who knows anything of the form or manner through which young persons learn, propose to improve elementary knowledge of this kind amongst them by a master's lecture, lesson, or otherwise, at the rate of three hours' instruction, over all the branches of learning, in a week, rather than the more social, more natural, less morally objectionable, and far more effective common class-teaching in their own schools, for the number of hours that they are open daily? The ladies of the convent look after the moral conduct and moral training of these girls; they direct them, while teaching the children; they superintend their classes whenever they join in them; they instruct them in needlework and the various forms of female industry; they witness the ladies conduct the schools, and direct their detailed economy; they see cleanliness, order, discipline maintained by peculiarly gentle means; and after all this, owing to a new division of labour, devised by Mr. Clarke, the ladies are to be denied the right of the gratuity, whenever merited, awarded to any ordinary schoolmistress in the land. To vote the gratuity to Mr. Hanrahan, because of his three hours' teaching of those girls in the week, and to refuse it to the nuns, who are their real teachers and trainers, is scarcely exceeded in absurdity by Peter, the London pavier, a fellow who hated work, but was given to speculation, who proposed to his fellow-workman, Jim, to apply

---

* Words from a simple sentence: Can, a noun common; Whining, a noun; This, a verb; depend, a noun; a, a definite article; the, the indefinite article; Can, a regular verb; sit, an adjective; over a lesson, over, an adverb; &c. &c.

† Moode, wher, wore (were), lik (like), rools (rolls), obgect, precent tence, Gramar, whare, Watre, siol (soil), rased (raised), purpos, Shean (sheen), exsept, equaly, nown (noun), pronown, plurel, there (their), blew (blue), currant (current), Wattered, Coharts, Speres (Spears), Crystures (Scriptures), Articale, definate, Grammer, Carefull (ly), writting, intranstive, negitive, relitive, iregular, singuler, Agitive, indictiv, prepotion (preposition) etymolog, eggipt, Athiahopia, Asserion, Nubua, indefinitive, Careffuly, infection (inflection).

apply the much-talked-of "division of labour" to their craft, Jim to strike the rammer, and Peter to cry Ha! Mr. Clarke would, however,extend this principle still farther; for while sub-inspectors have been doing the work of his district, he has been employed in little else than clerical duty at home.

I am strongly opposed to the principle involved in this movement, and not merely in so far as it affects monitors employed in convent national schools, but in relation to all schools whatever. I shall ever regard a school as undeserving the aid of a monitor, if the teacher be not able, willing, and anxious to undertake the entire instruction and training of the person to be appointed.

January 21st I wrote the report upon the examination of Mr. Clarke's monitors, and anxious to ascertain the nature and working of this so called monitorial school before going to Wexford to hold the examination of the teachers, I wrote to Mr. Hanrahan to have the monitors of both sexes assembled on the evening of 4th February that I might see them. On my arrival from Dublin on that day, I proceeded instantly to the school, and saw the assembled young persons. It was then near five o'clock and duskish; I inquired as to their ages, class in school, subjects taught in the evening, days of attendance, and hours, &c. from both themselves and Mr. Hanrahan; I directed the monitors to meet me on Friday, during the hour of recess, in the teachers' examination, that I might examine them. I met them on Friday, and was able to speak with them but a short time only, owing to the following reasons: When I made the promise on Wednesday evening I had not seen Mr. Clarke. On Thursday he left the examination room precisely at 5½ o'clock as mentioned in the regulations, and informed me that Mrs. Clarke, his wife, was ill; and that he could do no more work that evening. I had not known that, of course, when I made the promise to examine the monitors. Mr. Barrett and I continued the examination till later, and that night we remained up in the hotel until we had completed the marking of the women's (nine) written exercises. I intimated to Mr. Clarke next day, that it was my duty (as I had informed him by letter of February 1st) to examine the several official books of the district in compliance with the Board's instructions; and as I could not call to his house to examine them, I requested that he would send them to me, either to the school or to my hotel. He demurred as to allowing me to see his note-books, and stated that he was not bound to do so.* I saw a manifest inclination to occupy my time so as to make it impossible for me to examine the books that evening, as he knew that, next day being Saturday, I would return home; so I closed the examination of the teachers, the only subject not entered on orally being mathematical geography, which we could judge from the written papers, and 25 questions had been put upon local and descriptive geography. I also sent away the monitors, as, besides examining Mr. Clarke's official records, I had to classify 27 teachers. Mr. Clarke did not send his books to me to the hotel until a late hour, and after we had classified the teachers, so determined was he to prevent me if possible from examining his books, that although I wrote out and checked over with him the classification of the several teachers as agreed upon by us both, that he refused to sign the classification sheets for the office, until they were first written out, in order to occupy the time that I might otherwise give to the examination of his books. Of course, when he had under my hand the results of the examination, as checked by us both, no change could be made in the decisions; he changed his mind after, but I went on; wrote out fully the details of the 27 teachers and of some absentees, and then obtained his signature.

I mention these particulars that Mr. Clarke's character may appear in its true light in connexion with my not having examined the monitors as promised.† The two note-books sent in with my letter of April 10th last, and these two doubtless selected by Mr. Clarke as the most favourable specimens, as they refer to the period when he was working in order to remove his recent depression to the rank of sub-inspector, indicate very clearly why he threw obstacles in the way of their examination by me. I treated him with every consideration, and merely requested that he would allow me to see any two of his

* He read the code, and found his mistake.

† I need scarcely remark, that the examination of the monitors, and calling them together, were acts altogether extra-official on my part as head inspector.

his note-books, in order to enable me to report on the matter to the Commissioners.

Referring to my statement that the monitors' class was mixed as to sex, no one reading Mr. Clarke's account of the matter can doubt that such mixture is quite compatible with his report, as he constantly refers to it as a school, the monitors' class, &c., and never as two classes of different sexes.* It was only when I visited Wexford that I learned that the girls attended on three, and the boys on the other three evenings of the week. This, however, lessens the objections by one only, as these young persons go from school at three o'clock to their dinner, and return at four to the monitors' class in Mr. Hanrahan's school, and there remain an hour or so under instruction; whereas, if taught in their respective schools, it might be done the hour next before, or the hour next after, school time. In the two convent schools it could be done during school hours, as from the large staff of ladies the monitresses might get special instruction from some of them during the hours for general business. I was informed by Mr. Hanrahan that owing to the shortness of the evenings in December and January, there was little time left after four o'clock for instruction, as night falls immediately after.

I stated, amongst other objections, that Mr. Hanrahan's relation to all the monitors (with the exception of his own two), was in their capacity as scholars, and not as monitors, and nothing that Mr. Clarke mentions affects this obvious truism. It would appear that Mr. Hanrahan makes the eight or nine girls regard themselves now as ignorant of their letters, next as a class learning tables, then as parsing, next as a fourth reading class, &c., and in this pantomimic fashion he puts them through a sort of travesty of the actual business and varied duties of schools attended by hundreds of children, in which they spend five hours each day; and to complete the farce, this, with their special instruction as scholars, is all compressed into, and acted in, an hour each alternate evening.

It is said, in reference to the question of a mixed class of monitors, that I had a mixed class of teachers under examination in Wexford. It needs little observation to see the totally distinct character of both the parties, and the circumstances. Young persons from 14 up to 18 years of age (Mr. Clarke returned none as under 14; some of the eight whose ages were not returned may have been under 14), of different sexes going to and returning through a large town from an evening school, and mixing during the time of instruction, are very different from a number of men and women assembled in the one room, as they were on the two occasions referred to. At the examination in February 1856 there were only six mistresses: their written examination would occupy us an entire day, whereas a day was gained, and the business equally well done, by holding the oral examination of the men at the same time. The six women sat in three desks at the end of a room about 50 feet in length, the men under oral examination at the other end, with their backs to the mistresses; so that the inspectors could see that the women went through their written examination orderly and fairly, while occupied in examining the men; next day the oral examination of the women was held. Again, in January 1857, there were only nine women, and the same took place.† From the time the sexes entered the room until the moment they left, they had not the slightest intercourse, were never in proximity, both were deeply intent on what concerned their serious interests, and, except that the women could see the backs of the men, and hear one of their voices at a time, they were morally as much apart as if they had been separated thousands of miles from them. It is very true that Mr. Clarke would much prefer, but not on the grounds of moral apprehension,

* In Mr. Clarke's letter, dated the 15th December 1856, and which accompanied the monitors' exercises, &c., as sent to me, he distinctly states, "that the master of the Wexford Male No. 1 School, has been entrusted with the special instruction of the monitors of both sexes, and who has kept an evening school in constant operation for this purpose. I purpose to make a special report on the working of this school, as I have had frequent opportunities of visiting it, and it appears to me one which will strongly aid," &c. On reading this, no one can doubt that I was fully warranted in assuming, on Mr. Clarke's own report, that both sexes were taught together as one school.

† There were but a few of the 19 men in the same room with the women, as Mr. Barrett had some of the men in the junior school down stairs. Mr. Clarke had a portion in the teacher's parlour, at the end of the school, and I had the remainder in the lower end of the room, where nine women sat. Very Rev. Mr. Roche and one of his curates were present.

apprehension, far more time to be devoted to the examination of the teachers; not merely would it be easier work, but it would permit him to abstain from going out to inspect schools, a duty particularly irksome to Mr. Clarke. It is manifest, therefore, that no possible danger could arise from permitting the few female teachers to write their exercises in the room while the men were under oral examination, as now described; and also that there is no parity whatsoever between such an assemblage of persons for one day in the year, and of such ages, and an evening school constantly kept by a master, the pupils being of both sexes, as Mr. Clarke's letter led me to believe, and of ages varying from 14 to 18 years.

I have now noticed all the remarks made by Mr. Clarke in reference to the recommendation made by him that Mr. Hanrahan should receive the gratuities for the instruction of the monitors engaged in the two convent schools, and also in Wexford Male No. 1 School, and must repeat my former statement, that "I am much surprised at this singular and improper recommendation." * If such a principle be once adopted by the Board, the sooner the monitorial staff is disbanded the better; as it is clear that the teacher, whose pupil the monitor had been previous to his appointment, and whose pupil he continues to be during his term of office, is the proper and only party to receive praise or blame for the direction of the monitor's successful or unsuccessful course of study and of training. If it be done in Wexford, why not in Dublin, Cork, Belfast, and all the 13 towns in Ireland, the population of which exceeds that of Wexford, and these with large numbers of monitors? Let the alternative be put to the nuns; if not able, willing, and anxious to instruct these girls, during school hours, before school hours, or after, as most convenient to them, then they can have no paid monitors; and I at least have no doubt of what their response will be. Besides, in the large towns this principle would be attempted to be carried out in the case of double schools elsewhere, and at the caprice of an inspector or of a manager. The monitress in a girls' school might be directed to attend the master of the boys' school for evening instruction; and thus extend discontent, jealousy, and indifference to the best interests of the monitresses amongst the female teachers. In England there is scarcely an instance, except in the case of a married couple in charge of a mixed school, or of attached double schools, in which a master is permitted to instruct a monitress, as may be seen from the correspondence on the subject in the minutes of the Committee of Council on Education. Considering all these grounds both as to the moral and the scholastic aspects of the question, I am decidedly opposed to any departure from the practice heretofore followed in reference to the responsibility of the training and instruction of the monitors by their respective teachers; and although no one under the Board has laboured harder in favour of the plan of teacher-recruits than I have, or has watched more vigilantly to prevent and correct the abuses to which it is liable, I would feel it my bounden duty to recommend the immediate disbanding of that important junior arm of the teaching staff, in preference to its continuance under any such altered circumstances as those suggested by Mr. Clarke.

4. The fourth head in my letter is, "Summary of the results of the examinations" of the monitors, or the recommendations made by me in the 19 cases laid before me.

In making the recommendations upon the dockets wherever I had them† I stated my reasons in each case, and the results of the written and oral examination of the monitor; and the inspector's opinion of the teacher and the monitor generally were my only guides in forming such opinion. I now send in the actual written exercises of the monitors, and also a synopsis of the oral examination drawn up by Mr. Clarke, and since January last, I have made no entry of any moment upon any one of these papers. They furnish replies to Mr. Clarke's statements, pages 12, 13, 14, and 15, of his letter in reference to my complaint that "the examination was incomplete and unsatisfactory." Mr. Clarke

* On the second page of his letter Mr. Clarke wholly misquotes, or rather misapplies this extract from my letter of January 21st; he applies it to his recommendation to place the monitors of both sexes under the care of Mr. Hanrahan, whereas it is used by me solely in reference to the recommendation that he should be paid gratuities for other than his own monitors.

† In eight cases there were none.

Clarke, with a copy of my letter before him, misstates the facts in it; thus, page 14, he says: "I do not believe that the monitors were not examined on lesson books or arithmetic, orally, or in writing. In fact, this assertion is entirely unfounded." The statement made in my complaint was, that the whole 19 monitors should have been examined orally, on at least lesson books and arithmetic, but that this was omitted in the case of several, may be seen from the returns sent herewith, thus:

Of the 9 monitors and 10 monitresses there were examined on—

	Grammar.				Geography.		Lesson Books.	Arithmetic.	Mensuration and Geometry.	Algebra.
	Reading.	Text.	Parsing.	Spelling Book.	Dictation.	Text.	Maps.				
Written examination -	0	9 / 10		0	9 / 10	9 / 3		8 / 3	8 boys / 3 girls	3 / 0	3 / 0
Oral ditto - -	9 boys / 10 girls	9 / 0	9 / 0	9 / 3	0	9 / 3	9 / 10	0 / 0	0 boys / 0 girls	0 / 0	0 / 0

This analysis of the examination, so far as reported to me, or as indicated by all the documents forwarded, enables you to see the folly, to say the least of it, of Mr. Clarke in attemping to contradict, which he does with his usual confidence, the statements made by me, showing that he conducted the examination in an incomplete and unsatisfactory manner; and that it may be seen that I have not treated him with any degree of sharpness or severity in my report on his short-comings, I beg leave to send in herewith the returns of Mr. Conwell and Mr. Adair, as specimens of the style and manner in which other officers connected with me discharged the duties of the monitors' examination. These, with Mr. Clarke's papers, you will please return to me when examined.

There is only one of the 19 cases deserving of special notice in reference to my recommendation founded upon the examination; and fortunately it is one which will draw out in bold relief the character of Mr. Clarke. This is the case of Margaret Codd. In reference to this young girl, Mr. Clarke says that "He (Mr. Kavanagh) was not aware she had been attending the monitorial school until she had been examined and her promotion agreed upon. This fact I took particular care he should not know sooner, in consequence of his loud disapprobation, already expressed, of my monitorial arrangements. I thought it a good and fair way of testing his accuracy that he should have an opportunity of examining one of the monitresses without knowing she was such." Now Mr. Clarke evidently means by this that he knew that I had recommended the removal of Margaret Codd as unfit to be a monitor; but as I was not aware that she was the same person who came before me in January as a teacher, he would keep me ignorant of the fact, and await my opinion as to her worth, in order to test the value of my judgment in such matters. In this statement there is not a particle of truth, except so far as it may indicate Mr. Clarke's real character. Mr. Clarke was utterly ignorant, until after the examination of the teachers, of my opinion of M. Codd as a monitor; and even then, and now, he misstated and misstates what that opinion was. It may be true, that while ignorant of my opinion of her and of my recommendation about her as a monitress, that he may have watched with interest her examination as a teacher, and my opinion thereof; but it is wholly untrue that he had any knowledge whatever of my decision as to her case, or that of any other of the 18 monitors, until late at night on Friday, the 30th January, when the oral examination of the women was over, their written exercises marked, and we in the act of classifying the female teachers. It was only the previous week that my report upon the monitors was sent to the office; the results were not then communicated to Mr. Clarke; but so anxious was I to let Mr. Clarke know my views upon the subject (a subject to which no one has given more attention) that I not merely wrote to the teacher to have all the Wexford monitors

to

to meet me on my arrival, as already stated, but I purposely brought with me my letter book (copies); and on Friday night I not only allowed Mr. Clarke to read, but also to copy, my letter of January 21st respecting his monitors. It was then and thus he became first aware of my recommendations as to the individual monitors; and how far this correct statement accords with the drift of Mr. Clarke's account of the interest he felt in how my consistency was to be tested by the examination of Margaret Codd, it is for the Commisioners to judge. My consistency was tested, and the results proved the fixity of my opinions. M. Codd's examination in November 1856 as a monitress, especially in the important branches of Reading, Parsing, Spelling, Dictation, Geography, and Penmanship, so struck me, and it evinced so much superiority, that although only a candidate then, I recommended her appointment (in the school for which she was returned), and a gratuity to the teachers (nuns) of the first year. This may be seen on page 3 of my letter of January 21st, where that gratuity is recommended in her case, and also in those of the girls Smith and Power, whose names are above hers, and which letter Mr. Clarke copied with my permission. The statement on the next page (4) that the four last, which would appear to include the name of Codd, are "quite unfit," was evidently made from hastily glancing at the brace after the last three names, as if it included the fourth, which it does not; and an examination of the table shows that there can be no doubt whatever that a gratuity of the first year is recommended in her case. (*See* her papers, &c., herewith, as noted by me in January last.) Three months after Margaret Codd came before me as a teacher, and never having seen her before, and without recollection as to her examination as a monitress, I of myself placed her on 3d class with Mr. Clarke's full concurrence, and which she well merited. Whose the truthfulness, frankness, and consistency in this case, Mr. Clarke's or mine? He has overreached himself as he has often before done, and if he would only use rightly and on principle such means for discharging his duties as an officer and as a man, as he can command, his position, as to time, depression in rank, &c., might be very different in the Board's service. Mr. Clarke states that "He (Mr. Kavanagh) must have been mistaken in her (M. Codd's) case: and I believe firmly, he (Mr. K.) is so in the others." If my mistake be of the same kind as that of M. Codd, we know the result in each case. Let us see the cases in detail—

1. Lambert, Ladies' Island; Mr. Clarke and I agree;
2. Long, Enniscorthy; " " "
4. Couman, N. T. Barry; " " "
3. Leary, Piercestown; } " " "
5. M'Donald, Ferns; }

as to refusing gratuities to the two teachers who had charge of the instruction of the last two; and he differs with me only as to my recommendation to degrade each of the lads to the rank of previous years' status. I see no difference but that of degree in the disrating a monitor and disrating a teacher or even a higher officer.*

6. Connor, Wexford, M., No. 1.—Mr. Clarke and I agree, except as to the amount of gratuity; from his rank and the results of the examination, I recommend a first year's gratuity, only one year nine months' appointed, and Mr. Clarke a second year's.†

7. Pierce, Wexford, M., No. 1.—I recommend this lad's removal, and that gratuity be refused to his teacher; Mr. Clarke is of a different opinion. This lad is returned as 14 years of age, and appointed July 1856, and not only does Mr. Clarke recommend his retention as senior monitor, but, although only then four months in office, he recommends that a first year's gratuity be awarded to the teacher. Let us inquire into the qualifications of the boy from his written exercises and from Mr. Clarke's report of his oral examination:—

Written Examination.—Twenty questions were put before him on Grammar, Geography,

* *See* written exercises, and oral examination of both lads.
† *See* examination, oral and written.

Geography, Lesson Books, and Arithmetic; and of these he attempted 11, and did not enter upon 14;* of the 11, the answers to—

7 were wrong.
1 imperfect.
2 unsatisfactory.
1 satisfactory, and not quite so. (*See* paper.)

Penmanship, horrid.

Spelling.—Over 50 errors in a few pages. Here are a few specimens:—
Persnal, unthruth, progeets, rebil, singluar, heatred, Inions, furstated, nomitive, sons (suns), Allise, potatoo, axilary, figuars, nuter, Caracters, Emper (or), center, iregluar, centuary, deafeat, ultemetly, indictave, ambious, influine, possion.

In the oral examination he was asked—

10 questions in grammar; missed 7.
10 questions in geography; missed 3.

Got the lowest mark (D) in parsing and in outline maps, and a low mark (C) in reading. He failed in every question in the written paper on arithmetic; no oral examination on same subject.
He is wholly unfit as a monitor. (*See* his papers and Mr. Clarke's account of his oral examination sent herewith.)

8. Byrne, Wexford, Male No. 2.—In this case Mr. Clarke and I fully agree, except that I recommend the gratuity to be paid to Mr. Scallan, master of Byrne's school, instead of to Mr. Hanrahan, master of an adjoining school. As to the fine, it is stated upon the docket what it is for.

9. Banon, Castlebridge.—Remove him; no gratuity. Although Mr. Clarke groups his case with that of other parties removed or recommended to be removed, he does not enter upon the matter, and therefore I presume he does not dissent from my opinions.†

Written Examination.—Out of 20 questions only four attempted. Grammar, 1 attempted, unsatisfactory; lesson books, 2 attempted, one imperfect and one wrong; geography, 1 attempted, unsatisfactory; arithmetic, no paper returned; dictation, very bad; penmanship, horrid. (*See* Written Exercises.)

Oral Examination.

Grammar, of 10 questions, missed	8.
Geography, „ „ „	5.
Outline maps, lowest mark	(D).
Parsing, below lowest mark	(E).
Reading, second lowest mark	(C).

No oral examination in arithmetic or lesson books.
He is utterly unfit. Remove him.

Female Monitors.

10. Mary Smith, Kilturk.—She was appointed July 1855; examination held November 1856. I regard her answering as meriting, at most, a gratuity of first year, which ended only three or four months before the date of examination. Mr. Clarke thinks second year's; I think first. This is the only difference in this case.

Written Examination.

Eight of 20 questions attempted; of these—

5 were satisfactory;
2 were imperfect; and
1 was unsatisfactory.

Penmanship, very good.
Spelling and dictation, good.
No exercises on geography or arithmetic.

Oral

* Monitors were required to answer 13 only of the 20.

† *See* his examination.

Oral Examination.

Reading and parsing, second lowest mark	(C).
Spelling book, 10 questions, answered	8
Geography, 10 „ „	5
Outline maps, good mark	(B).

No examination on lesson books or arithmetic.

11. Eliza Power, Wexford, Fem., No. 2.—In this case Mr. Clarke quite concurs with me as to granting a first year's gratuity; but he would pay it to Mr. Hanrahan; I, to the teachers of her school.

12. Margaret Codd, Wexford, Fem., No. 2.—This case already disposed of; no difference of opinion between Mr. Clarke and me upon the matter, save that the gratuity is to be paid to the ladies of the convent, not to Mr. Hanrahan.

13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19.—These refer to the girls Murphy, Atkinson, Wickham, Roche, Hinds, Brophy, and M'Evoy, the removal of whom I have recommended. In all these cases Mr. Clarke differs in opinion with me.

13. Murphy:

Written Examination.—Of 20 questions four were attempted; of these three were satisfactory, and one marked (E) below the lowest; dictation, (E); spelling, 26 errors in a few words; penmanship, poor. No examination on geography, lesson books, or arithmetic.

Oral Examination.—Reading and parsing, (C) each; outline maps, (D). No examination in arithmetic or lesson books. Quite unfit.

14. Atkinson:

Written Examination.—Out of 20 questions one (in grammar) attempted, mark (E); does not know the common parts of speech; dictation, horrid; 36 errors in spelling in a few words; penmanship, poor. No examination in lesson books, geography, or arithmetic.

Oral Examination.—Marked (C) in reading, (D) in parsing, and (E) in outline maps. No examination in lesson books and arithmetic. Wholly unfit.

15. Wickham:

Written Examination.—Out of the 20 questions attempted, one in grammar, marked (E); has no idea of the parts of speech; dictation, very bad; 21 errors in spelling; penmanship, bad. No examination in lesson books, geography or arithmetic.

Oral Examination.—Reading (C); parsing (E); outline maps (E). No examination in lesson books or arithmetic. Remove: wholly unfit.

16. Roche:

Written Examination.—Answers have been attempted to six of the 20 questions; of these—

3 are satisfactory;
2 are imperfect; and
1 is marked (C), parsing;

dictation, poor; spelling, 15 errors; penmanship, very fair. No examination on geography or arithmetic.

Oral Examination.—Reading, marked (B); parsing and outline maps, each (C). No examination on lesson books or arithmetic. Not qualified; but the best of those rejected.

17. Hinds:

Written examination.—Three answers attempted to 20 questions; all three unsatisfactory; dictation, horrid; spelling, 23 errors; penmanship, pretty good. No examination on lesson books, geography, or arithmetic.

Oral Examination.—Marked (C) in reading, and (D) each, in parsing and outline maps. No examination in lesson books or arithmetic. Quite unfit.

18. Brophy:

Written Examination.—One answer, marked (D.), attempted to 25 questions; dictation, bad; 18 errors in spelling. No examination in lesson books, geography, or arithmetic; penmanship, pretty good.

Oral Examination.—Reading, marked (C); parsing, (D); and outline maps, (E). No examination in lesson books or arithmetic. Quite unfit.

19. M'Evoy:

Written Examination.—Three of 20 questions attempted; one satisfactory, one imperfect, and one marked (D); dictation, bad; 21 errors in spelling; penmanship, very bad. No examination in lesson books, geography, or arithmetic.

Oral Examination.—Reading, marked (C); parsing, (D); and outline maps, (E). No examination in lesson books or arithmetic. Quite unfit.

I have thus given the details of the 19 cases, the written exercises, the dockets (of most of the monitors)* and the summary of Mr. Clarke's oral examination of all the parties accompany this letter for verification and reference. If these are to be our monitors, and they obliged, as many suppose, to teach others all day, the sooner we abandon the monitorial scheme the better; I can be no silent party in carrying out a system alike destructive to the intellectual well-being of these young people, and delusive as an aid to the promotion of efficiency in our schools.

From first to last, Mr. Clarke's proceedings were most irregular in relation to the monitors. His mode of selecting them, as already pointed out, was wrong, and amongst the other strong objections to it, there is this, that as the schools differ very widely in suitability for the training of a monitor, so a competitive examination as to scholarship merely, must often have the effect of rejecting a qualified, but not the best lad from the monitorship in a school admirably efficient to train him, and wanting his services, and give it to a lad of higher attainments but under an inferior teacher in a school not so efficiently conducted, and of lower general claims to a monitorship. These questions of practical expediency could not be applied by Mr. Clarke from the manner in which he discharges his duties. You have before you two of his note-books with my letter of April 10th, and for reasons already stated doubtless the least faulty two that he could select, and from my tabular list of his inspection during March, April, May, and June 1856, as extracted from those books you will find that he alleges he paid 95 visits to 81 different schools wherein he found 4,931† pupils present or over 50 in each, and not only is there a total absence of all note or memorandum in reference to even one boy or pupil of merit, or promise such as might suit for the office of monitor, but there is no note of a single class or subject examined upon in any one of the 81 schools, or at any of the 95 visits. As to the classes it may be said that in nearly all cases there is an entry of the numbers said to have answered in the several branches, but even these bare figures are not entitled to reliance in fully half the schools visited, for reasons pointed out in my letter of April 10th, before I had any knowledge of Mr. Clarke's letter dated March 11th, and which communication I did not receive until May 10th.

Next Mr. Clarke appoints one-fourth of the 48 monitors of the district, in the four schools in the town of Wexford, although he states (page 7), that in these four schools there is only one teacher qualified and willing to give the 12 monitors the special instruction which they require. If so, why make the continuance in office of the 12 monitors contingent upon this one teacher remaining in that or any other school in the town, upon his consent to undertake or keep up this special instruction, or upon his removal from the school, that the manager would fill his place by a man of equal merit and suitability for this duty. If Mr. Clarke's statement be true, which I believe it is not, how does he

---

* Already sent in.

† None present at a few visits.

he explain his conduct in reference to any senior monitresses that may have been in the two Convent Schools, or monitor in the Wexford Junior Male School, previous to 1st July 1856? Was it precisely at this date that the nuns and Mr. Scallan became unable or unwilling to instruct monitors? Because if before it, and that there had been any monitor in any of these schools, Mr. Clarke should have had such appointment cancelled.

Mr. Clarke called in 19 instead of nine monitors to the examination; he first pleads that this made the examination more effective, and then turns round and gives this as an excuse for the omission of several prescribed portions of the oral examination of the senior monitors. The real object of calling in the 10 monitors appointed after April 1856, was to get up a pretext for awarding Mr. Hanrahan a gratuity for instructing these persons for four months (1st July to November) during which time they were under his tuition about 48 hours only, or 96, the time with both sexes included.

There were omissions of important portions of the examination in the case of every monitor examined, and Mr. Clarke's shameless contradictions of my statements under this head, drawn from his own returns, are numerous. There were only two questions asked of each of the nine boys upon the Spelling Book Superseded, and none asked of seven of the 10 girls. It is true that each wrote an exercise on Dictation, but the Programme very properly prescribes both, as the former tests their knowledge of the rules for Spelling, and many things besides simple Orthography. The boys were all examined orally upon both Geography (Descriptive and Mathematical), and Outline maps, but the 10 girls were examined upon the latter only; Mr. Clarke, suppressing truth, attempts to show that because at an examination of female teachers, I contented myself with 25 questions to each upon outline maps, owing to the call of other duties imposed by his want of co-operation with me, I am inconsistent; whereas the women had written their exercises on Geography (Descriptive, Mathematical, &c.), and seven of the 10 monitresses never wrote a line upon the subject. Neither boys nor girls were examined orally upon Lesson Books or upon Arithmetic; and seven of the 10 girls wrote no exercise upon either of these branches. Of the 10 girls, none were examined orally upon Grammar beyond simple Parsing, although the boys were; and several of the girls attempted no answer to the printed questions on Grammar, beyond the Parsing exercise. One of the monitors was in his fourth, two in their third, and four in their second year, and besides the omissions referred to, they were not examined orally in several subjects prescribed by the Programme. If Mr. Clarke had honestly put in the six hours plea, and that no more could be done in that time, one could understand him; but when he equivocates, and in the face of his own documents attempts to deny the shortcomings of the examination, it is my bounden but painful duty to expose the subterfuges to which he resorts. This shifting of the ground of dispute runs through the entire of his letter, thus he knew he was about to irregularly summon double the number of monitors required to attend by the Board's rule, yet he gave no intimation to have an adequate supply of dockets sent from the office, but now writes as if the error of this insufficient number sent belonged to the office, not to him. Again he states (page 16), that these dockets were not necessary for monitors appointed subsequent to April 1856, although he treats every one of these both as to gratuities to the teacher, and salaries to themselves, just as he treats those previously appointed.* He says, page 16, "for the same reason (10 of the 19 monitors not being liable to examination) the results of their (10 monitors) oral answering was not as fully recorded as that of those bound to attend. If this letter were referred to Mr. Kavanagh he should not have falsely argued that they were not examined on certain subjects, because he had not their answers on these recorded." I received in due course the copy of Mr. Clarke's letter, dated 15th December 1856 from the office, along with the returns of District 40, and on reference to that letter you will find the following: "It will be seen that their (the 10 monitors appointed after April 1856) answering was low. * * * The exercises of

* He is the only one of the 10 inspectors connected with me who was short of dockets. Mr. Conwell had the same number of monitors (19), and had a full supply of dockets. I think, from memory, that Mr. C. made a docket for M. Codd, whose answering was good; but the exhibition of the summary of the answering of those who had none, would be too glaring.

of all the monitors whether liable to examination or not are sent herewith; but the answers of some of the latter class are not summed up for want of printed dockets, the supply of which was too limited, a want which arose from the number in attendance being greater than was calculated on in the office. However, this is not to be regretted, as it would not be just to form an unfavourable opinion of these young persons from their present exercises as they have been so recently appointed." Now, Mr. Clarke here distinctly states, that he had sent the exercises of all the monitors of both classes, but he does not state one word in reference to the oral examination of any of them in the letter to which he refers. He had no dockets upon which to record the written examination of the recently appointed 10 monitors, but he sent all the exercises themselves, and he also sent a sheet, herewith forwarded, of their oral examination. I therefore did receive Mr. Clarke's letter of December 15th, but to state as he does, that I argued falsely from it in the manner stated, is not only untrue but highly insolent and reprehensible on his part. Lastly, under this head he says (page 16), "It is certainly inconsiderate and unjust on his (Mr. Kavanagh's) part to criticise what they were able to do; when, as he says himself, he knew nothing of their age and standing." This is certainly singular language, and a most strange statement to have referred to me for my explanation. I was fully aware that all of them except one, were paid monitors, or at least were so returned by Mr. Clarke; but of their precise ages, and the dates of their appointments, I was ignorant in eight cases; there being no returns sent to me of these matters. The Reading, Dictation, Penmanship, Oral and Written Parsing, and knowledge of Outline maps, of these parties were before me, as returned by Mr. Clarke, and as seen in their exercises. The Board's Programme of Monitors' (junior and senior) Qualifications at appointment was also before me, and to judge the former by the latter, and express my opinion that certain parties were quite unfit for any grade of monitor, and that I recommended their removal, was the precise duty assigned to me by the nature of the cases before me. This is what Mr. Clarke styles inconsiderate and unjust on my part; but he quite forgot, amongst other things, that I criticised what these young persons did not know, or were not able to do rather than what they did know, which was very little indeed.

Mr. Clarke's conduct, in the case of M. Codd, requires particular consideration; and apart from all the other circumstances of this question as to the monitors, and of his entire antecedents under the Board, it suggests how far any reliance can be placed upon the official statements made by him. I beg leave to request you will keep before you my letter of 21st January, an exact facsimilie of which (in my Letter-book) Mr. Clarke copied from, with my permission, while you are examining the following details:—I beg to call your particular attention to the Tabular List of Monitors (page 3) of my letter of 21 January, to page 4 of same, and to Mr. Clarke's letter of 11th March page 17, and page 22 and following.

Page 23. Mr. Clarke says, "She (M. Codd) is amongst those to whom he applies the remark, "quite unfit; remove them." This is quite untrue. There can be no doubt whatever that the brace ({), to the left of these quoted words, includes the names Murphy, Atkinson, and Wickham, and none others.

And not only is this evident to ordinary eyesight and ordinary honesty, but to both, in the clearest manner, it is expressed that Margaret Codd's examination merited a gratuity of the first year. Her name is twelfth in the list, when read from the top, and fourth when read from the bottom; and no quibble, cavil, or criticism can devise any reading or examination of the table, which can point out the faintest doubt that she, with the two girls Smith and Power, merited for their teachers a gratuity of the first year.

Again, he says, "For after the following names of monitresses in the Tabular Statement—No. 12, Margaret Codd; No. 13, Mary Anne Murphy; No. 14, Margaret Atkinson: No. 15, Kate Wickham—it will be seen," he adds, "the four last are quite unfit, so far as I can judge from the extent of the examination submitted to me;" and opposite their names are the words, "quite unfit; remove them." This last sentence is untrue, as the words quoted are opposite, and apply to the names of Wickham, Atkinson, and Murphy only, and not to the name of Codd. After which there is a specific and distinct indication, mathematically clear and straight, that she merits a gratuity for her teacher.

The

The first sentence also opens with an untruth, as it is attempted to make the quotation ("the four last," &c.) a portion of the table, whereas it is merely a comment upon it, and the error of four, instead of three, arose evidently from hastily glancing back at the foot of the table, when looking back from the subsequent page, upon which I was writing. Now, apart from the distinct ocular evidence that this error arose as stated (an error which contradicts the specific recommendation as to M. Codd, and adds one to the number included under the brace for removal), Mr. Clarke had further the internal evidence, known to him, that the expression, "so far as I can judge from the extent of the examination submitted to me," could not apply to M. Codd, as her examination, unlike that of the other three girls with whom she is associated, was quite as full, both oral and written, as that of the girls Smith (second year), and Power (first year), of higher standing; in fact, Codd was not then a recognized monitor, and no girl was examined at greater length.

I now leave to the Commissioners to form their own opinions of their officer, Mr. Clarke, and to judge how far any head inspector, who may be connected with him, can ever respect or confide in a man who could thus act, as he represents that he did, in relation to me, on the occasion of the examination of this girl as a teacher, in February last.

Mr. Clarke, with a presumption peculiarly his own, defines and prescribes the duties of his superior officer; his superior for nearly 11 years, and one whose instruction he was directed to attend, with a view to qualify him as inspector, previous to his appointment. Thus he says (page 22), "He should not have recommended their (eight monitors) dismissal; the Board will not, I trust, attend to his recommendation." Page 29, he says, "I think Mr. Kavanagh has adopted an unusual and irregular course in declaring paid monitors to be quite unfit," and recommending them to be "dismissed on examination of their written exercises only, without examining them orally, or even seeing them, and without consulting the district inspector in any way as to their merits." The course which I followed was that prescribed by the Board's instructions. I had before me not merely all the written exercises of the monitors, but also their oral examination as conducted and reported by Mr. Clarke himself, and it was no part of my duty to consult him or communicate with him on the subject. He sent the answering of the parties, and his opinion of them and of their teachers, with his recommendation on each case to the office; the office sent the matters to me for my opinion which I gave, and directed me to return the documents; and Mr. Clarke's insolent strictures upon the proceeding rather apply to the official instructions, and those who gave them, than to me who obeyed them. To state that it would be either unusual or irregular to dismiss a monitor or a teacher even, upon examination of the written exercises only of the party, is to affirm what Mr. Clarke knows to be contrary to the fact. In proof of this, I forward herewith a memorandum of mine upon my revision of the Written Exercises (1856) of the Masters of District 40, with Mr. Clarke's notes thereon, and his own letter, dated "Education Office, 8th August 1856," agreeing to my decision to remove incompetent teachers upon their written exercises only. I never having seen the parties or orally examined them, and never having heard any report of their oral examination by any person. He was further fully aware when he made that improper charge against his superior officer, that Mr. M'Creedy, Mr. Butler, and others were in the habit of similarly removing parties upon examination of their written exercises only when these proved very bad. Surely if a lad or girl cannot distinguish a noun, or even spell the word noun; if the young person has 50 errors in Orthography in a few sentences, and is reported by Mr. Clarke as deficient in the portion of the oral examination which he was put through, there is ample evidence that such a child or youth is unfit to be a monitor.

Another, and the last instance which I shall quote, of Mr. Clarke's *ad captandum* reasoning, is contained in his report of the remarks made by me on the occasion of meeting the monitors in Wexford School, 6th February last. Page 20, he alludes to my recommendation to have a lad Pierce removed, being unqualified, and is silly enough to advance against me the charge of inconsistency because I told the lad "that he was a good boy, and had an honest face," a *non sequitur* scarcely inferior to Sheridan's opinion of an actor's debut, that he thought him "a very tall young man." Of the same class are the remarks reported in reference to what I said to the young persons generally.

I spoke kindly and encouragingly to them, expressed my gratification at seeing them anxious to improve themselves, &c., but never told them they were good monitors or good scholars, told them how best they could become so, and sent them away kindly expressing the hope that I would meet them again. Not one sentiment fell from me in the slightest degree inconsistent or contradictory, and the drift of Mr. Clarke's statement to the contrary is utterly unfounded. The simple proof of this is the fact that Mr. Hanrahan, their teacher, Mr. Clarke, the inspector, and Mr. Barrett, sub-inspector were all present, and to each of them I had expressed in private my disapprobation of the monitorial arrangements, and my disappointment at the qualifications of the younger portion of the monitors whose examination I had looked over.

I have been engaged in the examination and classification of teachers for 13 to 16 years, and have been associated in that duty with 40 inspectors, and in relation to these thousands of teachers the records of the office do not contain a page of correspondence from me regarding a difference of opinion with any of these 40 gentlemen as to the classification.

It is now for the Commissioners to decide as to the conduct pursued by Mr. Clarke in this whole matter; several other mis-statements, glosses, and equivocations remain unnoticed by me, but I have gone into quite as many as will be sufficient to throw light upon the character of the officer and the man. It little accords either with my disposition or with my practice, during the 17 years that I have been in a position over others, to assume the attitude which I have been obliged to take in relation to Mr. Clarke. Few who have filled, or who may ever fill, the office which I have the honour to hold, can with more well-founded reason be thankful that it has rarely fallen to their lot to be even the instrument of pain or punishment to the inspectors acting with them; but there are just limits even to clemency, and whenever I meet such want of principle as is here clearly set forth, it shall receive just exposure.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh*,
Head Inspector.

Grenville, Rathgar,
25 July 1857.*

The Secretaries, Education Office.

Wexford District.

Gentlemen, Wexford, 9 August 1858.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 30th ultimo, enclosing a communication, dated the 25th July 1857, from Mr. Kavanagh. in which, as head inspector, he replies to mine of the 11th March previous.

In answering his former letter, I remarked he had mixed the subjects treated of in it somewhat confusedly together. I said so, as it is evident under head No. 3 of it, he treats both of the questions as to the payment of the gratuities, and also of the nature of the monitorial school itself, wrongly describing it as a mixed evening school, and therefore fraught with moral danger. On the present occasion he lays down a division of subjects which he engages to follow, but no sooner has he well commenced to write of the first, the local distribution of the monitors through the district, than he says "under this head I may notice, &c.," and proceeds to condemn my mode of selecting the monitors, a subject quite distinct from the other, and now introduced by him for the first time. This system of introducing new subjects, many of them quite extraneous to the matter in hand, he follows throughout his unnecessarily lengthened communication; he quits a subject, and after writing about a variety of others, returns to it either to state over again, or to contradict what he has already said; he brings forward new charges, and indulges in personalities; conceives himself at liberty to throw out the most unfavourable imputations, and to attribute the worst motives; he gives the most untrue account of certain transactions, and upon

---

* Received in Office 28 July 1857.

upon these misstatements builds up a superstructure of calumnies, so numerous that it will necessarily occupy a considerable time to expose them. He has thus so widened the field of controversy, that while the matter of his former letter was exhausted by the division under four heads already given, it will now be necessary to answer him on many others.

The following are the heads under which I shall arrange this letter :—

1. The local distribution of the monitors throughout the district.
2. The mode of selecting the monitors.
3. The annual examinations of monitors for 1856.
4. The Wexford Monitorial School.
5. The examinations of teachers in 1856 and 1857.
6. Mr. Kavanagh's recommendations to dismiss 10 monitors, against which I protested.
7. Transactions which occurred between us on his visit to Wexford in February 1857.
8. Replies to certain of his strictures on my proceedings.

1. Mr. Kavanagh sets out by acknowledging his error in assuming the whole number of paid monitors in the district to be 19, instead of 48, which he says, he learned it really was on his arrival in Wexford a few days after. It was on this wrong assumption alone he based his assertion, that to give 12 monitors to the town of Wexford was a highly injudicious proceeding. But he does not think for a moment that he ought to have thereupon written to the office to acknowledge his error ; no, he still insists his conclusion was right for a reason not before specifically mentioned by him, namely, that Wexford contains but one-twelfth of the population of the whole district (it is somewhat more), and not one-twentieth of the number of schools in it, &c. Now, the Board never ordered that the monitors should be appointed in numbers exactly corresponding to the population of the different localities ; and if such an order had been issued it would have been impracticable to comply with it. What the Board ordered was, that schools having a certain number of pupils in daily average attendance, and with teachers holding a certain class, should be considered eligible for obtaining monitors. The question is, did I obey this order ? My answer is, I did ; and Mr. Kavanagh himself says so, when he mentions, but only for the purpose of finding fault, that I sent round a printed circular to the managers of all the national schools, having an average daily attendance of 35 pupils under a teacher, ranking at least in the third class, first division, informing them they were entitled to a paid monitor, and inviting them to send in candidates for the monitorships to a public examination. I accept this description of my proceeding as correct. The candidates appeared accordingly ; the most eligible were recommended, and their appointments made by the Board.

It is apparent that Mr. Kavanagh in asserting that the monitors should have been appointed in various localities in numbers having a fixed relation to the population, assumes that qualified candidates were to be had in the different places in at least the like ratio to the number of inhabitants ; and also, that the schools declared by the Board eligible to receive monitors were distributed in the same way ; but of these assumptions he offers no proof whatsoever. Indeed, I think he himself did not perceive the fallacy to which he gave expression.

For my part, I never expected to find that whilst a locality containing 2,000 inhabitants might produce two well qualified monitors, one having 5,000 should therefore show exactly five monitors, and in the same way one having 10,000 should show 10 monitors. I did not anticipate that any inspector of experience could seriously put forward such an expectation. The degree of education varies in different localities, and is not always proportional to the population.

The monitors were recommended in compliance with the Board's views, and their appointments would not have been confirmed had those views been in the smallest degree disregarded.

But it so happens, they are very fairly distributed over the district. Wexford, with a population, in round numbers, of 13,000, got 12 monitors ; Newross, population 7,000, had six monitors ; Enniscorthy, population about the same, five monitors; in all, 23 monitors to an aggregate population of, say 27,000.

The remaining 25 were distributed through the district in rural schools, where such were eligible under the Board's order.

2. Mr. Kavanagh next introduces a totally new charge, that my mode of selection was wrong; that the inspector, before recommending the monitors, should have had a personal knowledge of them, acquired in the schools during his tours of inspection; says that two of my note-books are perfectly blank in this particular, "not the name of a single pupil or his answering" (meaning as an individual) "entered in them," &c. He then imagines I shall put forward what he is pleased to call "an apology," which he immediately refutes, apparently to his own satisfaction, while it is evident the "apology" is entirely of his own invention; in truth, it would never occur to me to apologise at all on this subject. What he describes as the duty of an inspector, to acquire a knowledge of the pupils as individuals, is not so, but the duty of their teachers. The business of an inspector is with the pupils *en masse*, as forming schools divided into certain classes, and exhibiting a certain relative proficiency to the numbers under instruction; according as he finds a certain proportion of them instructed up to a certain standard fixed by the Board, he forms a judgment, favourable or otherwise, of the school. Notwithstanding that I hold this view of the inspector's duty, I still think myself able to decide, after examination, if a candidate monitor be eligible, and even to say if he be the most so in his neighbourhood, from my general knowledge of the school sending him in.

Because Mr. Kavanagh did not find, as he asserts, the names of any "boys of promise," "unpaid monitors," "recruits," in the two note-books he took away with him from Wexford, he concludes that I had no personal knowledge of the candidate monitors previous to examination; but this is not a correct inference. In truth, I did recollect, on examining them, to have met many of them as pupils and unpaid monitors on my tours of inspection.

3. In March 1857, when answering his charge that my examination of the monitors was incomplete and unsatisfactory, I showed that he was wrong in this also; that they were examined in all respects according to the directions of the Board, for three hours by written exercises, and for the same orally; that many not bound to attend came in addition, in order to accustom themselves to the routine of the annual examinations; and that I explained this in a letter (dated 15 December 1856) accompanying the exercises; also, that the answers of these last were not fully recorded on certain subjects. I made no such plea as he mentions I did, "want of time to examine on some subjects." He argued that certain monitresses were not examined by printed papers on some subjects, because he found on these no answers from them; an incorrect conclusion evidently, as I pointed out. The simple explanation of this was, that they were unable to answer the questions on these subjects in the time allowed by written papers; they were all girls not bound to attend.

He now repeats his assertion, just as if its inaccuracy had never been pointed out; gives the names of the girls, "Murphy, Atkinson, Wickham, Roche, Hinds, Brophy, and M'Evoy," 7 of the 19 examined, and says, "they were not examined in geography, lesson books, or arithmetic, by written papers; at least, I must presume so, when their exercises thereon are not sent, although those by them on grammar and dictation were forwarded to me." He adds, that "there is not a single fact set forth by me respecting the details of the examination but is drawn from his (Mr. Clarke's) own returns." I have to say, that he may have drawn all his inferences from my returns, but, like the one just mentioned, many of his inferences are untrue in point of fact, and illogically drawn.

He then remarks, that "an efficient, anxious officer would have extended the time of the oral examination; but I think this would have been a very improper course, and one that the monitors and their parents might justly complain of: a six-hours' examination is a very exhausting one. As to devoting a second day to it, as he suggests, that would have been irregular, as the Board ordered one day only to be so employed.

4. Mr. Kavanagh's next subject is the monitorial school, which he acknowledges he was in error in describing as a mixed evening school. He says he did not know its true nature until he came to Wexford; and yet afterwards he most inconsistently speaks of it as such, for when defending the course he adopted, of summoning the male and female teachers for examination together,

he

he says, "that was totally different from young persons of different sexes going to and returning from an evening school, and mixing during the time of instruction." He also repeats other objections to it. My reply to his former remarks was, that it was not a mixed school; that it was sanctioned by the local patrons, and by an official letter of July 1856, from the Board; and that it had also the warm approval of the monitors' parents.

Mr. Kavanagh now ridicules the idea of requiring monitors of any grade to devote the whole of the school hours to teaching; and setting out with the assumption that such is the case in Wexford, writes a great deal about monitors and the mode of training them. Now, all this might have been omitted, for there is no foundation in anything I wrote to warrant his often repeated inference that the monitors receive no instruction during school hours. They were never employed teaching for more than half the school hours, and have always received instruction for the remaining half, and there is no statement of mine to the contrary. They have also always attended the evening school for special instruction, which lasts, not, as he says, for three hours, but for six hours a week.

He next says that the recommendation to pay the gratuities to the teacher of the evening monitorial school is wrong in principle and opposed to the Board's regulations; and again, he calls it a singular and improper one. And yet, when in Wexford, he assured the teacher in my presence, that he should be paid the gratuities for all the past time; although he spoke strongly against the school for the future, and said "it would be broken up," "that he would not tolerate such a proceeding," &c. He also assured the teacher that he had mentioned his name to the Board in his letter, after a manner that would do him credit. But I am unable to find any remark of the sort respecting this teacher in all he has written. On the contrary, he attempts to cast ridicule upon him for the occasional use of model lessons, when instructing the monitors. In this proceeding he is ridiculing also the practice of some most eminent training institutions.

5. In my former letter, while showing that the monitors of different sexes were never brought together for instruction, which Mr. Kavanagh asserted was the case, I noticed incidentally that he himself, on the other hand, attached no practical importance to this principle of keeping them apart. As an example, I mentioned he was in the habit of summoning even the adult teachers of different sexes of this district for examination on the same day and in the same apartment, and that I had strongly objected to it. To this he now replies that the cases are totally different; that, at the teachers' examinations "the men sat with their backs to the mistresses;" that the inspector, while occupied in examining the men, could see at the same time that the women went through their written examination orderly and fairly; that from the time the sexes entered the room until they left, they had not the slightest intercourse and were never in proximity; both were intent on what concerned their serious interests; and, except that the women could see the backs of the men and hear one of their voices at a time, they were morally as much apart as if they had been separated thousands of miles. He then imputes an unworthy motive to me for desiring to have separate days devoted to the examination of the teachers of different sexes, and which I shall not notice. There is nothing he puts forward in defence of his system of examining male and female teachers together that has altered my opinion of its impropriety. I do not believe that an examiner, while occupied with the oral examination of one class can exercise a proper supervision over another engaged in writing answers to printed questions. Besides, the answers given orally by the teachers of the one class will be often upon the same subject upon which those writing are engaged, and will thus unduly assist them. As to the teachers being morally apart, as Mr. Kavanagh says, as if separated thousands of miles, it happened in Wexford that they were in attendance together rather more than half an hour before the time appointed for the examination, and before the arrival of all the inspectors. On this occasion the school-room was in an uproar with those young men and women romping together in an unseemly manner. Such a circumstance might give rise to serious scandal, and could not have occurred had the masters and mistresses been collected together on different days. Add to this, that summoning them together involves their travelling together, both coming and

returning, and also their stopping together at the same lodging-houses when in town.

6. I have now to notice Mr. Kavanagh's defence of his recommendations for the dismissal of certain monitors, against which I protested.

I take up the case of Margaret Codd, which he treats of first. I stated in my letter that he was not aware she had attended the monitorial school until he had examined her as a teacher, and her promotion was agreed upon ; that I did not let him know this sooner in consequence of the loud disapprobation he had already expressed of my monitorial arrangements ; and that I thought it a good and fair way of testing his accuracy that he should have an opportunity of examining one of the monitors without knowing she was such. In this statement Mr. Kavanagh now asserts "there is not a particle of truth." "Mr. Clarke was utterly ignorant, until after the examination of teachers, of my opinion of Margaret Codd as a monitor, and even then and now he misstated and misstates what that opinion was." * * "It is wholly untrue that Mr. Clarke had any knowledge whatever of my decision as to her case, or that of any other of the 18 monitors, until late at night on Friday, the 30th January (he should have said Friday, the 6th February) when the oral examination of the women was over," &c. "It was only the previous week that my report upon the monitors was sent to the office ; the results were not then communicated to Mr. Clarke," &c. He then goes on to say that, on Friday night, he allowed Mr. Clarke to read and copy his letter of 21st January 1857, respecting the monitors ; and it was then and thus he (Mr. Clarke) became first aware of his (Mr. Kavanagh's) recommendations. In reply to all this, I beg to say that I was perfectly well aware of Mr. Kavanagh's recommendations for the dismissal of a considerable number of the monitors, and of his general condemnation of the monitorial school, before reading his letter of 21st January ; and it was from his own lips I derived the information ; he himself alone was my informant. At the school, and long before the oral examination of the female teachers was commenced, he condemned in a loud, and indeed dictatorial manner, all the arrangements for the instruction of the monitors, to me, and in the presence of Mr. Barrett, sub-inspector, also in that of the teacher, Mr. Hanrahan. He told me further, that all the monitors were dismissed. I expressed surprise, and said I had got no Board's Order to that effect. "Well," said he, "at least all the junior monitors." "What, all in the district?" said I, wondering to myself that those could be dismissed who had not been examined. "Yes, all," said he. "But I have got no Board's Order to that effect either," I answered. His reply was, that such an order would reach me very shortly, and that he would show me his letter, recommending it, at the hotel. I had not seen the letter when Margaret Codd came under examination ; but in consequence of these, his adverse, remarks on the monitors, did not volunteer to inform him she was one, or that she was attending the monitorial school. If he had been loud in his disapprobation of the monitors as a body, he was equally loud in praising this girl on examining her as a teacher, so much so, that Mr. Barrett, who was near me, remarked his inconsistency, and said, "Had you not better tell Mr. Kavanagh that this is one of the monitors?" "By no means," said I ; "after condemning them all, he is now praising this one ; he will evidently class her as a teacher ; let him proceed." The result proved my anticipation to be correct. Mr. Kavanagh is inaccurate in saying I took a copy of his letter. I took no copy of it. I read it at his request, and immediately told him it was wrong ; that it contained many mistakes ; that the monitors were not quite unfit, as he described them, but well qualified ; and that I would leave nothing undone in my power to prevent their dismissal. I had no copy of his letter until I received it, with yours of the 3d March, requesting my explanation.

He now disclaims all intention of dismissing Margaret Codd as a monitor, and says he recommended her appointment as a paid monitor, with a gratuity to the teachers of the school. But this is not in his letter of the 21st January. My conclusion that he intended to dismiss her was drawn from this remark in his letter, "the four last are quite unfit," &c., and from this, that her name is among these four, and a brace (}), with the words "quite unfit—remove them," appears opposite those names. He now says that the brace does not include her name, but only those of the last three monitors ; and that his statement, which would appear to include the name of Codd, namely, "the four last are quite unfit,"

"was

"was evidently made from his hastily glancing at the brace (drawn by himself) after the last three names, as if it included the fourth, which it does not." Here Mr. Kavanagh acknowledges he committed the error of writing the words "the four last" instead of "the last three," owing to hastily glancing at the brace (drawn by himself), which he thought seemed to include Codd's name. This explanation might be taken as satisfactory; his error was one of haste: but he afterwards deprives this explanation of all grace, or, rather, denies it, and thus actually contradicts himself. For, having quitted the subject, he returns to it towards the close of his letter, and says "the brace (}) includes the names of Murphy, Atkinson, and Wickham, and none others." "And this is not only evident to ordinary eyesight and ordinary honesty, but to both in the clearest manner it is expressed that Margaret Codd's examination merited a gratuity of the first year." Remark, he says this after having acknowledged that even he was mistaken about the brace, thinking it included four names instead of only three. And if we grant the brace does not include Codd's name, it will be seen that neither the words "gratuity of first year" nor any others are opposite to the name, but certain dots, to which Mr. Kavanagh may attach any meaning he pleases, or none at all, and therefore the recommendation is by no means clear. But surely he has no right to impute untruthfulness to me, and still less for this, that I interpreted his own words "the four last to refer to four and not to three monitors; and that I put the same interpretation on his brace, the same exactly as he acknowledges he did himself, that it seemed to include four names. As Margaret Codd was not a paid monitor it was not regular to return her with a recommendation for a gratuity to her teachers, and it was therefore the more natural to conclude he included her in his report as one of the alleged bad appointments.

I do think it very probable that if I had not had an opportunity of answering his letter a Board's Order would have issued for her removal; my letter rendered this impossible. When a pupil at the Wexford Female National School, this girl obtained the first prize awarded by Dr. Lover, after an examination on lectures delivered here for the Royal Dublin Society; afterwards, she received the first prize in a similar way from Dr. Sullivan, on behalf of the Board of Trade; ranked by Mr. Kavanagh and myself as a teacher of third class, second division, last year, I then had her admitted to the Central Training School, whence she has just returned, ranking second class, second division, *i. e.* within two steps of the first class, and noted for admission to the special class for training; a very satisfactory progress after only one year's service as a teacher.

It was not, however, on her case alone I argued Mr. Kavanagh was mistaken in his recommendations. I quoted that of Ellen Roche, also, in detail, and showed that mistakes had been made in both; and added, that I believed all the rest against whose dismissal I had protested to be qualified too. In Mr. Kavanagh's letter of the 21st January, there is a brace opposite Ellen Roche's name, and those of three others, with the words "all quite unfit; no particulars as to their ages." He now holds to this opinion in these four cases, but a little modified about Ellen Roche, for instead of repeating "quite unfit" of her, he says, "not qualified, but the best of those rejected." It is to be borne in mind this girl was not liable to examination, but she attended for her own improvement; and this fact was known to Mr. Kavanagh, by his own admission, from my letter of 15th December 1856. His present statement about her written exercises, taken from my marks thereon, amounts to this, that no one single answer to the six questions she attempted of the printed papers was wrong, or even unsatisfactory. One of these was most important, the passing exercise and I marked it "C.," that is, "of average excellence," or "fair." For these questions she was allowed three hours, or half an hour for each, a very moderate time for a monitress under any circumstances. That she was able to do so much within it was highly creditable to her, who not only never attended an examination before, but was even not yet liable to attend. In England, under the Committee of Council, even teachers are allowed three quarters of an hour to each question. Now, as to her oral examination, reading is marked "B.," that is one step only from "A.," the highest; parsing and outline maps "C.," that is, "of average excellence." After this statement Mr. Kavanagh asserts that this girl is "not qualified," and repeats his assertion that she was not examined on lesson books or arithmetic, which I have already

refuted. Besides, he had every opportunity, when in Wexford, of examining her orally on these subjects; but although he summoned her for the purpose he omitted to do so.

On the 11th of March 1857, when first replying to him, I wrote regarding her: "She reads with entire ease and fluency; can read any of the poetical pieces in blank verse of the 'fourth book' with accuracy, ease, and expression; has a good accent and correct pronunciation; has a tolerable knowledge of grammar, can parse ordinary sentences; has worked and knows all the compound rules of arithmetic; knows the maps of the world and Europe; writes a good hand; writes fairly from dictation; has a knowledge of needlework. She is a senior monitress of the first year, having been selected by me last July (1st July 1856), and is 14 years of age." I say now, as I said then, if she be quite unfit as a monitress, there is no monitor or teacher in the kingdom qualified to hold office.

Mr. Kavanagh copies in long detail the marks obtained by the monitors as noted by me, but I cannot agree with the inference he draws therefrom, for he does not describe their import correctly, as defined officially. Thus he calls E., "below the lowest mark," whilst I cannot understand anything to be lower then the lowest. Again, he says of the mark, C., "second lowest mark," but it is defined in the printed registry of monitors, issued by authority, to mean "fair," or "tolerable." It is in this sense I used it as indicating average excellence. He frequently also uses the expression "horrid," with what exact technical meaning I cannot tell. Thus, of penmanship in Pierce's case, he says "horrid." Now, this boy wrote a very improvable hand, of an angular sort, always had his copybook neat, and was improving in this branch. Again, in Barrow's case, penmanship "horrid," whilst my mark is "C.," meaning "fair." Thus, Mr. Kavanagh's conclusions respecting the monitors, as drawn from my marks on their exercises, are of no value; for he interprets the marks in a lower sense than that defined by the Board, and as used by me.

After the annual examination of monitors for 1857, the head inspector, in whose circuit this district was then placed, did not recommend the removal of any of the paid monitors, against whose dismissal I had protested. This may be sufficient to prove they were then qualified. Is it possible they were quite unfit a year before?

And, it may be asked, what do the local patrons of the schools think of the matter? I append two letters addressed to me on this subject; one from Mrs. Butler, superioress of the Presentation Convent, the other from Mrs. Walsh, of the Convent of Mercy, patronesses of the two female schools in Wexford. I need hardly say, the evidence of these ladies is above being questioned; they treat of all the points in dispute, and agree perfectly with my views.

"Presentation Convent, Wexford,

"Dear Sir, 6 August 1858.

"In compliance with your request that I should state my opinion respecting the arrangements you made relative to our paid monitresses, I beg to say, that your increasing the number from one to four has proved a great assistance in the instruction of the children, whilst we have never lost sight of the necessity of teaching the monitresses themselves. They assist in teaching the junior children for an hour and a half each day, during the remainder of which they receive instruction from the nuns in all the branches taught in the school, work, &c. included. I consider that the monitresses derive great improvement from the instruction given them in the evening by Mr. Hanrahan, who has, I think, a peculiar facility in imparting the method approved of by the Board, especially in arithmetic. I distinctly understood that he was to receive the gratuities as remuneration for the time and attention he devotes to the monitresses in the evening. As we have rather more than 400 children on our rolls, we could, with advantage, employ and train a greater number of monitresses than as yet you have been able to afford us, for during the time we had but three, I employed a pupil at my own expense as an assistant, and I am happy to say that she improved so much that she has since obtained a situation under the Board. As to the monitresses you mention, I beg to say that I would not have recommended them for your selection, if I did not think them capable of becoming in time efficient schoolmistresses. Ellen Roche reads prose and poetry remarkably well, parses fairly, and has a good knowledge of

of the large maps and geography; she spells correctly, and her writing is good. In arithmetic, she has worked rule of three, and is learning practice. All the monitresses write from dictation. There has always been great attention paid in this school to the different kinds of needlework, in which the monitresses are not at all deficient. I shall not trouble you with further details, but I beg to assure you, that I can speak in favourable terms of Anastasia M'Evoy and Maria Brophy, our junior monitresses. They all write from dictation, and I consider them well-conducted, intelligent, and respectable girls.

"I remain, &c.

"H. P. Clarke, Esq." (signed) "*M. J. E. Butler.*"

"St. Michael's, Wexford, Convent of Mercy,
7 August 1858.

"Mrs. Walsh begs to inform Mr. Clarke that the sisters have found by experience the great advantage of the arrangement by which, two years ago, he increased the number of paid monitresses from one to four, where there is so large an attendance at the school, the number on the rolls being upwards of 300 children. Those monitresses appointed are capable of advancing the children in the different branches taught in the school, and enjoy the advantage of attending an evening school taught by Mr. Hanrahan, an arrangement of which they highly approve. In addition to this, they are, and always have been, taught for an hour in the morning in the school, and for another hour in the afternoon, by the sisters most capable of instructing them. They join in the classes for religious instruction for half an hour; in all, they receive in general two hours and a half literary and religious instruction daily. They are occupied themselves teaching, generally speaking, for the same length of time, two hours and a half. The sisters are quite willing that Mr. Hanrahan should be paid the gratuities, in consideration of his evening school. With regard to the qualifications of the three monitresses mentioned by Mr. Clarke, M. A. Murphy is a very nice reader; she reads even poetry very expressively; uses the 'fourth book,' can parse fairly in same book. She knows the large maps so well as to be able to teach them to the juniors; writes a neat hand; writes correctly from dictation from the 'fourth book;' writes poetry well from the 'third;' has worked proportion and vulgar and decimal fractions, and is expert at working sums in these rules; she sews neatly, can knit, and has worked crochet. Margaret Atkinson is not so far advanced; she is only a junior monitress, but she reads fairly in the 'fourth book'; parses pretty well, making an occasional mistake; she has learned, by tasks, geography of all the continents, and the descriptive geography of the 'fourth book'; has a fair acquaintance with four of the large maps. She is not as careful as she ought to be about writing, but is improving a little; writes from dictation pretty well, making an occasional mistake; works sums in vulgar fractions, and has learned proportion and practice; does needlework daily. Kate Wickham's qualifications are rather higher in all branches than Margaret Atkinson's; she holds an intermediate place between her and Mary Anne Murphy. The sisters think them all very well qualified as monitresses, and find them anxious to please, and attentive to their business, except Kate Wickham, who has been irregular in attendance."

It appears, from these letters of the patronesses of the schools, first, that there is ample work for the monitresses; secondly, that they receive instruction in their own schools for half the day; thirdly, that they receive special instruction in the evening school in addition, and derive great improvement from it; fourthly, that the patronesses approve of the teacher being paid for this special instruction; fifthly, that all the monitors are well qualified and are progressing, but that one has been irregular in attendance.

7. I now come to speak of certain transactions between Mr. Kavanagh and myself, on his visit to Wexford in February 1857.

In the first place, I received a note from him appointing Wednesday, the 4th February, to examine the district book, registry of monitors, &c. I waited at home accordingly all day to receive him (*see* my journal, week ending 7th February 1857), but he did not come. At nine o'clock at night I received a

memorandum from him, saying he would meet me at the examination of teachers next morning, the 5th. In his present letter he says he intimated to me next day, alluding to the 5th, that it was his duty to examine the district books, as he had informed me by his note of the 1st February. But I have to remark that this is incorrect; his note appointed the 4th for this business, and he broke his appointment. Further, it was on Friday, the 6th February, he said what he mentions. He adds, I did not send them to his hotel until a late hour. This is incorrect; the porter left them there at two o'clock, which was some hours before he returned from the teachers' examinations. He did not begin to examine them until late at night on the 6th, the day he asked for them. As to my leaving the examination-room at half-past five o'clock on Friday, the 5th February, that required no apology. Indeed, I do not think it was right to keep the teachers later to meet the head inspector's desire to return to Dublin as hurriedly as possible, or for any other reason. He could have no more important business in Dublin than he had in Wexford, viz., to conduct the examination of the teachers, without distressing them or others engaged in it, and with due calmness and deliberation. I did demur for a moment, as he says, to produce my note-books, because it did not occur to me it was necessary. I looked upon these as my private property, while the district book, monitors' registry, &c., are official records belonging to the district. But the delay did not exceed two minutes. I produced them the moment I understood it was in the Code of Instructions to do so. He says, also, I showed a manifest inclination to occupy unnecessary time with the examination and classification of the teachers, to avoid this checking of the district books, and omits to mention his breach of appointment on the 4th. I had no desire of the kind. I waited at home all day on the 4th, with the books ready for the purpose, by his own appointment, which he did not keep. He then endeavoured to do this business on the 6th, a day already appointed for the examination and classification of the teachers. Here again I met his views, and after being occupied with the teachers for 6½ hours, including a quarter of an hour the monitors were before us, I again transacted business with him for five hours, from six o'clock until eleven o'clock at night, to enable him to go to Dublin on the next morning, Saturday, the 7th. (*See* my journal to that date.) He next objects that I refused to sign the classification sheets until they were filled up; a most strange objection, such a one as, in my whole experience, had never before been made of me, and one which I could certainly never comply with. By the remark he condemns himself. In fact, he asked me to sign these papers in blank. When he asked me to do this, as a matter of course I declined, but said I would fill them up myself very quickly. This offer he refused, but was, nevertheless, unable to fill the papers himself alone; for it was necessary to enter the average attendances, roll numbers, and other particulars from the district book, which was done by Mr. Barrett and myself, and was fully half the business. He might have added that I declined to sign those papers until Mr. Barrett and I had checked them, which we did accordingly; and the reason for this I mentioned to him, that the year previous three or four mistakes occurred owing to his refusal then to wait until they were checked, and which were commented on by letter to me from the Education Office. These I showed him in my letter-book, sent with the other official records for his examination. In reply he said, "I never make mistakes;" and yet, when Mr. Barrett and I were checking the classification sheets we discovered three undoubtedly his own, and which were accordingly pointed out to him as such. He says, "I changed my mind after" (meaning that I consented to sign the sheets in blank); but that he "went on," &c. I say, most solemnly, I did not. He asserts also that he wrote out fully the details of the 27 teachers and of some absentees, and then obtained my signature. I reply that half the work was done by Mr. Barrett and myself. I did not sign the papers until we had checked them, and I had said previously, I would not do this sooner. The papers are in the office; are they all in Mr. Kavanagh's writing? if not, he is wrong. The most favourable view I can take of his account of what took place on this evening is, that he has written it with no distinct recollection of the real facts.

With singular irrelevancy and bad taste, he has referred in his letter to a decision of the Commissioners adversely affecting me. I shall not canvass the decision to which he alludes, which the Board remedied some months after, unsolicited

unsolicited by me. The only sentiment connected with that transaction I entertain towards the Commissioners is that of gratitude for the latter proceeding.

I have already commented on some remarks he threw out on the state of two note-books of mine he examined. The objection he starts about the notes on the classes he answers himself immediately afterwards. The note-books were well kept, notwithstanding what he may say to the contrary. He left Wexford on the following morning, Saturday, the 7th February, taking away the note-books, without my permission or previous knowledge. I received a memorandum from him after the coach had left, saying, "I have taken the note-books; back on Monday." But he broke his promise, and sent them to the Education Office with a letter of unfavourable criticism on them, where they remained many months to my great inconvenience.

He states that he appointed the hour of recess, on Friday the 6th February, to examine the monitors; that he saw them then, but could speak to them a short time only; he also implies that my leaving at half-past five o'clock on the 5th, the day previous, prevented the examination on that day. I say it did not. It was not necessary I should be present. He first appointed the 4th, to see them, by a note to the teacher, without asking me to be present, or letting me know anything of the matter. He came, and stopped only a few moments; then he named the 5th; kept them on that day several hours waiting, and did not see them at all; then named the 6th, at one o'clock. They waited on him from before that hour until a quarter past four o'clock, when, after a few minutes addressing them, he sent them away without examining them. It is evident he broke all his appointments with them. It is equally evident to me that had he kept any one of his appointments, and examined the monitors, he would have found ample grounds for retracting his hastily written report declaring them to be unfit, which he might then have gracefully done, and both he and I would have been spared the trouble of this most painful controversy.

8. Mr. Kavanagh remarks that I have attempted to define and prescribe his duties; that he has been my superior officer for nearly 11 years; and that I was directed to attend his instruction to qualify for the office of inspector, before my appointment. In reply, I have to say, that I have mentioned what was necessary to rebut his charges, and have given my reasons where I dissented from his assertions. Whatever I said of his duties was pertinent to the matter in hand, and was founded on the Board's regulations. The only occasion upon which my district was placed within his circuit was when I came to Wexford three years since; it remained under him for little more than three years, and I had very little communication with him, as, for the whole of that period, he never inspected a school within its bounds. I was never directed to attend his instruction. About the time of my appointment, one of the Commissioners suggested that I should visit the Dublin Model Schools, which I did accordingly, and, among the rest, the male school, of which Mr. Kavanagh was then head master, and I there witnessed his mode of teaching. This is the only ground for his assertion on this point; its worthlessness is evident.

I objected to paid monitors, not liable to attend the annual examination, being dismissed thereon by a head inspector alone, who had not examined them orally, or even seen them, and without obtaining the consent of the District Inspector, or consulting him on the matter. I said the signatures of both these officers should be to such a recommendation. To show that I am inconsistent in this, Mr. Kavanagh quotes a note of mine to him, dated August 1856, which he describes as agreeing to his decision to remove incompetent teachers on their written exercises alone, he never having orally examined or seen the parties. But I was perfectly consistent in writing that note, which was one consenting to the dismissal of certain teachers bound to attend examinations, and on their written exercises alone, provided Mr. Kavanagh signed the recommendations to that effect. I have now to say that he refused his signature, although he declared they were unqualified from his own examination of their written exercises, on the plea that I wanted him to share the public odium of the act. Now, I thought he ought to be willing to share it, and held to my views. In consequence of this, the teachers remained in charge for some months, when, on coming to Wexford, he at length signed their dismissals, conjointly with myself. There is evidently no parity between the two cases.

Having now noticed the whole of the subject of Mr. Kavanagh's letter, under the heads which I laid down at the commencement, and having placed it, as I believe, in its true light, I shall now close without noticing some of his remarks, which are merely of a personal nature.

I have, &c.

The Secretaries,
Education Office, Dublin.

(signed) *H. P. Clarke*,
Inspector of Wexford District.

No. 1. (B.)

CORRESPONDENCE between the Commissioners of National Education in *Ireland* and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools), and with Mr. *J. G. Fleming*, District Inspector of National Schools, relative to the removal of a Teacher from, and her Re-appointment to, the Talbotstown Female National School, County Wicklow, from the 31st January 1857 to the 3d of August 1858.

Gentlemen, Grenville, Rathgar, 31 January 1857.

THE examination of the female teachers of District 35 (Wicklow), just now concluded, brought under my notice an omission of duty on the part of Mr. Fleming, the Inspector, which my duty compels me to submit to the Commissioners.

In August 1855, Mr. Fleming visited and examined Talbotstown Female National School; manager, Rev. Mr. Nowlan; teacher, Anne Goss.

He again visited, 26th November 1855, teacher-in-training Mary Murray, substitute, age 19 years. No examination of substitute. Report on her and school quite as favourable as those usually made on schools so circumstanced.

At next visit, 20th March 1856, Mary Murray is teacher; her age is now reported as 17 ½ years, but Inspector states his opinion that her looks indicate only 15 ½ years. And he further adds, that an erasure in the register as to her age (when a pupil) leads him to believe that Anne Goss, recently expelled the Training department for theft, tampered with the entry in order to sustain Mary Murray's statement as to her age. On the twofold ground of her youth and want of literary qualifications, Mr. Fleming strongly urges the immediate removal of Mary Murray; and on perusing the report it will be seen that several circumstances as to the opinions of manager's curate, those of a farmer, Anne Goss, residing with Mary Murray's family, &c., are brought in to support Mr. Fleming's recommendation.

Upon this report salary is withdrawn from Mary Murray, and manager is called on to appoint a successor to her. He takes exception to Mr. Fleming's opinion as to teacher's qualification, urges various reasons of a peculiarly local nature in favour of her retention in the situation, and begs the Commissioners to reconsider their decision.

On the matter being referred to Mr. Fleming, he was unable to assume an attitude becoming his position as an Inspector, because he had never examined the teacher, and he was therefore obliged to postpone the expression of an opinion on the merits of the case until he should visit the school again.

On mentioning this serious omission, which the Code (Art. XIV., also Head 5, Art. XX), common sense and justice would alike indicate, Mr. Fleming's explanation is that he had examined her in class as a pupil in August 1855; and from this, and what he witnessed in the school, he felt warranted in declaring her incompetency. On the visit referred to there were over 50 pupils present: 11 in Mary Murray's class (fourth), and little over two hours devoted to the entire examination of the school, with a view to a primary report. She was neither candidate, teacher, or monitress; it was utterly impossible that Mr. Fleming could have anticipated the circumstances which led to her appointment, and therefore there cannot have been anything peculiar in his examination of this one pupil. Incompetent in August 1855, she may have been equal to a probationer in March 1856; especially as she had had the stimulus to improvement,

improvement, arising from practice in teaching during almost the whole of the interim, and salary and promotion.

As to the question of age, I have no doubt whatever that the young woman correctly stated her age at 17½ years then, and it is clear that the error is Mr. Fleming's own. He returns her as 19 in November 1855, when substitute, and the first time that objection is made or heard on the ground of youth was 20th March 1856. As to the alleged tampering with the register because it contains (I suppose) some evidence of erasure, had such been designed to meet an objection never before made, clearly it would have been made to tally with Mary Murray's previous return of her age as 19, and not with her later and contradictory statement of 17 ½ years; or had she given two different statements, doubtless Mr. Fleming would have added this to the other cumulative grounds upon which he recommended her removal. On the other hand, if, as is most probable, he did not inquire as to her age when substitute, but estimated it at 19 years, the scrutiny of four months after reduced her to 15 ½ years.

Mr. Fleming visited in August 1856, when he strongly urged that the manager's application be granted, and singular, he again infers her qualifications and recommending her removal without examination, he again recommends further trial without examination either, nor does he make a single entry in the observation book which would explain the change of opinion to his successor.

The teacher was summoned for examination here this week, and in acknowledging the receipt of the summons, the manager wrote a very disrespectful and offensive letter to the secretaries, expressing his want of confidence in the examination if Mr. Fleming should take part in it. Mr. Fleming, Mr. Coyle, and I examined Mary Murray with 21 other mistresses, seven only of whom were probationers, nine being on third and seven on second class, and in one important branch (arithmetic), in which the female teachers are generally very deficient, her answering as to amount, matter and form was the best of the whole party. The question which we had to discuss was, should she not be placed, relatively to all our other decisions, on first division of third class; we placed her on the lower division however.

I may here add, that I had to call Mr. Fleming's attention last autumn to some serious instances somewhat similar to this, in which he expressed himself in the strongest and most decided terms in the observation books, as to the unfitness of teachers, and in his next or subsequent reports in the book, the same parties being in charge of the schools, no explanation whatever is put forward to account for the change of opinion. The cases of the worst kind are Carrigowen (12/6/55), and Barniskey (18/12/55.) In the latter, he states, "Neatness and cleanliness, worse if possible than at last inspection; accounts carelessly and negligently kept; suggestions left wholly neglected. I believe he is a most indolent and inefficient person, and I earnestly recommend Rev. Manager to remove him from a situation for which he is wholly unqualified." Mr. Fleming called on the manager that day, and in his next report in the observation book, there is no reference whatever to any change in the state of the school. In the former school he states that the teacher "cannot be sanctioned as qualified to conduct a school," and no reference has since been made to the matter in the observation book.

The Talbotstown case is sure to obtain circulation through the manager, Rev. Mr. Nowlan, and it must interfere with the efficient discharge of Mr. Fleming's duty in that quarter (Carlow) of the district. If careful examinations of newly appointed probationary teachers are necessary in order to protect the interests of the pupils, they are equally necessary for the protection of qualified persons against hastily formed opinions which may degrade them and deprive them, as in this instance, of their bread. I may add, that I know nothing of the case, except as it has come before me officially and from examination of Mr. Fleming's reports, &c. I believe I have seen Rev. Mr. Nowlan a few times in my life, last time some six years ago, but I know nothing of the matter from him, or through him.

I remain, &c.

The Secretaries, Education Office. (signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

Sir, Education Office, 2 March 1857.

Enclosed is a communication of the 31st January last from Mr. Kavanagh, Head Inspector, calling attention to an omission of duty on your part in recommending Mary Murray, the teacher of the Talbotstown Female National School, to be removed for incompetency without first ascertaining by examination the extent of her literary qualifications, &c.

We are to request that you will furnish, at your earliest convenience, some explanation in reference to the statements contained in Mr. Kavanagh's letter, which you are to return.

We are, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross,* } Secretaries.
J Kelly, }

J. G. Fleming, Esq., District Inspector,
Rathdrum.

Roll, No. 1789.

Talbotstown Female National School (1), County Wicklow.

Gentlemen, Rathdrum, 24 April 1857.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2d ultimo, enclosing a communication from Mr. Kavanagh, Head Inspector, calling attention to an omission of duty on my part in recommending Mary Murray, teacher of the Talbotstown Female National School, to be removed for incompetency, without first ascertaining by examination the extent of her literary acquirements.

As the facts of this case have not been correctly reported by Mr. Kavanagh, in his communication of 31st January last, it will be necessary for me to give a detailed account of what really occurred in connexion with my recommendation for M. Murray's removal from the Talbotstown National School, after which I shall point out the several omissions and inaccuracies which I have detected in Mr. Kavanagh's statement of this case.

I first visited the Talbotstown Female National School in August 1855, Anne Goss being the teacher in charge; M. Murray, soon after substitute teacher, and subsequently regular teacher of that school, was present on the occasion, and read in fourth book, with her companions of fourth class, to which she belonged. Her features, figure, and general appearance were those of a mere school-girl, of some 14 or 15 years of age. Some of her class-fellows were her equals, and in some respects her superiors in literary attainments; for I recollect perfectly well that her answering on geography, grammar, and the subject-matter of the lesson-books was far below the minimum standard of proficiency now required by the Board's programme of school course for every intelligent fourth class pupil. Mary Murray, in short, was very young, and very ignorant.

On my second visit to the Talbotstown School, in November 1855, I was much surprised to find this young inexperienced creature acting as substitute in the room of the regular teacher, A. Goss, then at the Central Training Institution. Being perfectly well aware how very difficult it is for managers to procure persons suitably qualified to act as substitutes during the absence of the regular teachers in training, I saw that Mary Murray's appointment, even as temporary teacher, although seriously injurious to the school, was, as in many other similar cases, an unavoidable evil for which the existing regulations supply no remedy. She was for this reason tolerated by me, and allowed to retain her temporary position of substitute teacher.

It was on the occasion of this visit that Mary Murray returned her age as 19 years. Now I was quite sure she was not that age; knowing, however, that she had but two or three weeks more to remain in the school (the regular teacher having nearly completed her course of training), I thought it wholly unnecessary to make any further inquiries regarding her age, which was accordingly returned in my Report (26/11/55) as 19 years.

The regular teacher, Anne Goss, was expelled for theft from the training institution in December 1855, and being thereby disqualified for holding any situation

situation under the Commissioners, the manager of her school was called on to dismiss her. He deferred doing so, and in the meanwhile wrote to the secretaries in her favour, requesting she might be allowed to remain, at least on trial, in her situation as teacher in Talbotstown Female National School. To this request the Commissioners declined to accede.

The manager (Rev. Mr. Nolan) then appointed Mary Murray, former substitute teacher, as the regular teacher of the Talbotstown School; he at the same time directed the dismissed teacher, A. Goss, to continue in the school, where she accordingly remained as an assistant to M. Murray. In point of fact, A. Goss was still the *bonâ fide* teacher of the school, M. Murray the nominal teacher under her tuition and guidance.

It is, I conceive, pretty clear from this arrangement of the manager, that he himself did not then regard M. Murray "qualified to conduct the school with efficiency," else why retain another person to assist her, the average attendance for the year being under 30. It is, further, important to note that A. Goss remains up to the present in the Talbotstown Female National School, nominally as a pupil, but in reality as an occasional assistant to Mary Murray, the recognised teacher. This arrangement is, I think, very objectionable. The cause of A. Goss's expulsion from the Dublin Training Institution was well known through the parish; and a young woman convicted of theft could not be respected or regarded by any sensible, thinking person as a fit teacher or companion for young children.

Mr. Kavanagh remarks, that there were over 50 pupils present on my first visit (13/8/55.) to the Talbotstown Female National School, 11 of whom were in Mary Murray's (4th) class, and but little over two hours devoted to the entire examination of the school, with a view to a primary report. I devoted two hours 15 minutes to the inspection referred to by Mr. Kavanagh, who forgets to state that 21, or nearly one-half of the gross attendance of pupils then examined, were in first class. Their examination occupied a comparatively short time, I had consequently ample opportunity to test the literary acquirements of the remaining classes, although there were 11 of fourth class present. I believe the report of a head inspector on national schools is far more specific in its details, and embraces more points of inquiry than even the primary report of a district inspector. Now Mr. Kavanagh, who seems to consider 2 hours 15 minutes too short a time for the inspection of a school with an attendance of above 50 pupils, nearly one-half of whom were in first class, got through the inspection of the Ballinacorrig National School, 3551, on 23d September last, in 2 hours 20 minutes, although there were above 80 pupils present, under the charge of a first-class teacher, a paid monitor, and a work-mistress. On the day after (viz. 24/9/56.) he inspected the Arklow Female National School, 147 pupils present, in 2 hours 10 minutes.

I partially assisted Mr. Kavanagh on both the occasions just mentioned, and in the case of the Arklow Female National School considerably more than one-half of the children present were in 1st class; but after making all due allowance for these circumstances, it certainly seems strange that Mr. Kavanagh should regard 2 hours 15 minutes too short a time to devote to the inspection of a school with an attendance, it is true, of above 50 pupils, 21 of whom, however, were in first class.

My third visit to the Talbotstown Female National School took place on 20th March 1856. I then felt bound to make minute inquiries regarding Mary Murray's age, for she had now become the principal teacher of the school. The return of her age in my report of the 25th November 1855, when she acted as substitute, was, as in the case of substitute teachers, made without special inquiry of the fact; I did not, as already explained, think it necessary to go beyond the girl's own statement of her age.

The case, however, assumed a very different aspect when Mary Murray became the regular teacher of the school; accordingly, when I found her in March 1856 acting as such, I made special inquiries about her age, which, after some hesitation, she stated was 17½ years. She had, be it remembered, shortly before this returned her age as 19 years, which was much in excess of the truth. This circumstance, coupled with her hesitating answer, and her appearance so extremely juvenile, that of a mere school girl, in fact, led me to entertain serious doubts of the truthfulness of this second statement of her age. I therefore endeavoured to ascertain as correctly as possible what her age really

was. I failed, however, in getting satisfactory producible evidence on that point, and had consequently no other course open to me but to return Mary Murray's age as estimated by herself at 17½ years, accompanied by the remark that her looks and general appearance indicated only 15½ years.

The plain statement just given relieves me, I think, from the task of further noticing Mr. Kavanagh's opinions regarding M. Murray's age. His attempt to prove that the statements of her age in my reports of 11/55, and 3/56, are contradictory and inaccurate, wholly fails from the absence of any evidence or facts to support his view. Before leaving this portion of Mr. Kavanagh's letter, I feel it necessary to direct attention to the following passage in it, first paragraph, page 4: "On the other hand, if, as is most probable, he (Mr. Fleming) did not inquire as to her age when substitute, but estimated it at 19 years, the scrutiny of four months after reduced her to 15½ years." The word estimated is underlined in Mr. Kavanagh's letter. What reason has he for supposing it most probable that I estimated Mary Murray's age, in plain language, guessed it? I reply without the slightest hesitation that he had not a particle of proof or reason for such an extraordinary assertion, which, if left uncontradicted, might possibly injure my official character. I, therefore, feel bound in self-defence to give it the fullest and most unqualified contradiction.

Mr. Kavanagh observes, in paragraph 2, page 3 of his letter, "As to the question of age, I have no doubt whatever that the young woman correctly stated her age at 17½ years, and it is clear the error is Mr. Fleming's own." Why has Mr. Kavanagh no doubt on the point, and what error does he mean? The error, I suppose, of stating that the girl or young woman was not more than 15½ years. I still adhere to that statement. Of course any one may err in his estimate of another's age, but as Mr. Kavanagh is not endowed with any special gift for guessing ages, the error is just as likely to be his as mine, for we have no reliable evidence on the subject of Mary Murray's age. Besides, a year had nearly passed since she returned me her age at 17½, and Mr. Kavanagh then saw her for the first time.

I had an interview with the Rev. Mr. Nolan immediately after my third inspection of the Talbotstown Schools, on 20 March 1856, when I called his attention to the extreme youth and inexperience of the newly appointed teacher, M. Murray. I added, that as the interests of the school must suffer from so injudicious an appointment, it would be out of my power to sanction it in my official report on the school. Failing to convince him of the necessity of any change in his arrangements, I left him, after a lengthened but friendly discussion of the case, with the understanding that I would recommend withdrawal of salary from M. Murray, and that he would appeal from my decision, and bring the matter under the notice of the Commissioners in case they acted on my Report.

In taking this course, I acted with perfect good faith and candour towards the manager, with whom I was on the most friendly terms. I had nothing to gain, no object to serve, in differing with him about his teacher's qualifications. I simply withheld my sanction from his injudicious appointment because I felt that the interests of the school required me to do so.

Salary was in due course withdrawn from Mary Murray, from 31st May 1856, on my report, and same notified to manager, B. O. 9/5/56, "Inspector having reported that she is not qualified to conduct the school with efficiency." The wording of the Board's order makes no reference whatever to her literary acquirements. Her salary is stated to be withdrawn because "she is not qualified to conduct the school with efficiency."

And here it is all-important to observe that there were three distinct reasons urged by me (in Report of 20/3/56) for the removal, first, extreme youth; second, total inexperience of school keeping; third, want of adequate literary acquirements. I stated in my report that I did not at the time test her literary acquirements. Why? Because I was perfectly satisfied that the other two reasons alleged were quite sufficient in warranting me to recommend her removal.

It was, in fact, a perfect mockery to place so inexperienced a young creature over children. She knew nothing whatever of school keeping. Her attempt to examine a class in the most rudimentary subjects was a complete failure, for the very obvious reason that she was (and is still, unless much improved since January last) wholly ignorant of the subject matter of the Board's lesson books.

books. This was quite apparent from the questions she put to her pupils. But Anne Goss, not Mary Murray, was then the *bonâ fide* teacher of the school. The latter was merely qualifying for her task under the guidance and tutelage of the former. I could not, of course, be a party to any such an arrangement; I therefore felt bound to throw the entire responsibility of organising and examining the classes on M. Murray, who, when unaided and left to her own resources, was utterly unequal to the duty.

I was thus, in accordance with Art. XXXIII. of the Code, enabled to "judge fully of the teacher's merits as a school keeper and instructor of youth," and finding her altogether wanting in these most essential qualifications of a teacher, I felt justified in recommending her removal. I accordingly stated in my Report (20/3/56), "The manager of this school will not remove M. Murray unless called upon by the Board to do so. This interference is, however, very necessary, as I believe the interests of the school will be sacrificed should so young and inexperienced a person be permitted to remain in charge of it. This is also the opinion of the resident Roman Catholic curate, who is well acquainted with the facts of the case." I expressly added, that I did not, on the occasion of this visit, test the literary acquirements of the teacher.

I beg to add, that I adopted precisely the same course in the case of the Wicklow Female National School, visited by me in June 1855 and January 1856, when I recommended the removal of Anne Salmon, the newly appointed probationary teacher, without any previous examination of her literary acquirements, but merely because I believed her to be wholly deficient in method and experience. All this I stated in the observation book of the school, which Mr. Kavanagh saw. He had all the facts of the case from the manager, Rev. Mr. Grant, and his curate, Rev. Mr. Sullivan, in Wicklow, February last; and he then and there not only formally approved of what I had done, but on his own part specially recommended Anne Salmon's removal, she being at the time a probationary teacher who had for the first time come to an examination. I should add, Mr. Kavanagh, when he recommended manager to remove her, was wholly unable to form any idea whatever of the nature or amount of her literary acquirements; he had not, in fact, seen her written paper, with which she was then engaged, and her oral examination had not begun. Indeed, he looked over none of the female teachers' papers until the following Monday or Tuesday, when I called at his residence to assist him in the examination of those papers, and the teachers' classification.

The above statement of facts requires no comment; it speaks for itself.

I have referred in a preceding paragraph of this communication to Mary Murray's ignorance of the subject-matter of the lesson books; in proof of this statement, I appeal to the testimony of her exercises, written during the examinations held on 29th and 30th January last, when, after the lapse of nearly an entire year for study and preparation, she failed in giving a satisfactory answer to any one of the questions taken from the lesson books for the examination of probationary female teachers: her oral answering on the same subject was, if possible, worse.

I can state, without any hesitation, that during my 10 years' experience as a school inspector I never before met with any teacher so grossly ignorant of the Board's reading books; yet Mr. Kavanagh, writing of this young person's classification, says, "The question we had to decide was, should she not be placed, relatively to all our other decisions, in first division of third class.

I held no discussion of the kind with Mr. Kavanagh; he and I simply glanced over the figures denoting the answering of the several teachers of third class, comparing Mary Murray's marks with those of persons promoted third; but we had not much difficulty in ascertaining that her answering was of a very inferior kind, for she failed in every subject (arithmetic alone excepted) on which she had been examined. The idea of promoting her to third never entered my mind; such a promotion would have been a complete burlesque and mockery on the whole system of teachers' examinations. Let Mary Murray's exercises be produced, and even a hasty perusal of them will, I think, satisfy any unprejudiced mind of the entire accuracy of what I have just stated.

The next step in this case is the manager's appeal to the Commissioners, requesting them to reconsider Mary Murray's case. His letter of appeal was enclosed to me in secretaries' letter (10/7/56), asking my opinion as to the expediency of granting her a further trial.

Soon after the receipt of this letter, early in August last, I had an interview with Rev. Mr. Nolan, in his own house at Rathvilly. He there urged several reasons, which he conceived should induce me to give my formal sanction to Mary Murray's appointment in the Talbotstown school. He mentioned that he found it impossible to procure any more eligible teacher; that Mary Murray, although young and inexperienced, was steady and painstaking, and sincerely anxious to qualify for her situation. She was moreover under the immediate control and superintendence of her parents, owing to the proximity of her father's house to the school; a most important circumstance, some of the previous teachers having lost their characters in consequence of keeping low and improper company.

These statements were, I thought, deserving of the most serious consideration. I therefore considered it my duty to embody them in my report (13/8/56.) on the Talbotstown school, accompanied with the remark, that as Mary Murray had, in consequence of A. Goss's assistance, somewhat improved in method, it would be desirable to let her remain as temporary teacher, but not recognised or sanctioned by the Board (and consequently without salary), until the examination of female teachers took place, when her case would be brought under the notice of the Head Inspector, for his final decision.

I felt that I exercised a wise discretion in adopting this course, for although I still declined the serious responsibility of formally sanctioning the appointment of an unsuitable person to the charge of a National School, the manager must have been satisfied that his case would be sure to get a just and impartial hearing from the Head Inspector, and that I had no wish to deal with it in a summary and unfair way.

The manager appeared quite contented with the arrangement. He said he knew Mr. Kavanagh very well; that he would write to him on the subject, and that he was quite sure of obtaining justice at his hands.

It is necessary to add, that during our interview not a single word was said about Mary Murray's literary acquirements. There was no necessity for any remarks on that head. Rev. Mr. Nolan (manager) knew perfectly well why I declined to recognise her as a suitable teacher for the Talbotstown school. He knew that my chief objections to her were on the grounds of her extreme youth, want of method, and inexperience; and therefore it was that we never entered into the question of her literary acquirements.

All that has been stated in the preceding page of this document is fully corroborated by the answers to Queries 13, 40, and 41 in my report of August last, on the Talbotstown Female National School, to which I respectfully beg to refer.

Mr. Kavanagh read that report, and yet he writes (rather flippantly, I think) in second page of his communication, of 31st January: "On the matter being referred to Mr. Fleming, he was unable to assume an attitude becoming his position as an inspector, because he had never examined the teacher; and he was therefore obliged to postpone the expression of an opinion on the merits of the case until he should again visit the school."

The subject matter of my reports (20/3/56., and 13/8/56.), and the brief account of what passed between Rev. Mr. Nolan and myself during our interview in August last, are, I conceive, a sufficient reply to this portion of Mr. Kavanagh's letter.

I certainly deferred my answer to the Secretaries' communication, requesting my opinion as to the expediency of granting Mary Murray a further trial, until I had an opportunity of again visiting her school. Why? Because as she had been all along under the guidance of a most intelligent trained teacher (A. Goss), she might have so improved from the date (3/56) of my former visit as to be in a position to qualify as a probationer.

I therefore felt it necessary, for my own protection, to visit the Talbotstown school before replying to the secretaries' letter of July 1856; not, however, for the purpose of examining the teacher, as Mr. Kavanagh imagines, but simply with the view of ascertaining what improvement, if any, had taken place in her method of teaching, &c. Mr. Kavanagh imputes to me a very different motive for that visit; a motive, however, which had no existence but in his own imagination.

I must here observe, that when I informed the Rev. Mr. Nolan, in August last, that his teacher's case would come before the Head Inspector for consideration, I was under the impression that it would have been finally and speedily arranged.

arranged. After the usual examination of female teachers (then approaching, as I thought) had terminated, Mr. Kavanagh was then residing in this district, where he remained during the months of August and September; I therefore very naturally expected he would hold his annual examination of the teachers sometime in August, or at furthest in September, during the fine warm weather, when most of the schools are closed for vacation, or else very thinly attended, in consequence of harvest operations.

But no such examinations took place; not, certainly, from want of time and opportunity, since Mr. Kavanagh might have easily devoted two days, the time required for the teachers' examinations, out of the two entire months he remained in the district. But he did nothing of the kind; the examinations for 1856 were unnecessarily deferred till 29th and 30th January 1857. Worse still, the examinations for 1855 were postponed till 22d and 23d February 1856.

On these two occasions adults of both sexes were brought together; the females writing, or rather endeavouring to write their exercises, while Mr. Kavanagh and the district inspector conducted the oral examination of the male teachers.

Now this practice, for I believe it is the practice of Mr. Kavanagh, is open to very grave objections. It is, in the first place, most unjust towards the female teachers, who cannot possibly give their undistracted attention to the brain work before them; for they must necessarily be disturbed by the noise and clatter of tongues incidental to the oral examination of a number of male teachers.

The practice now noticed is obviously objectionable on moral grounds. A large number of young men and women, most of them unmarried and necessarily distant from their homes, are assembled together on a winter's day, in some large town or city, with means at their disposal for dissipation if so inclined, their travelling expenses having been just paid them. The dictates of prudence and common sense are alike opposed to such an improper arrangement, from which, if persevered in, serious evil will result. The practice is most obnoxious, and replete with danger to the morals of our teachers. The plea of necessity cannot certainly be urged in its favour, and the sooner it is given up the better. I shall merely add, that it is dealing very unjustly with the teachers, males and females, to require them to travel from home, frequently with very little money in their pockets, 30, 40, and occasionally even 50 miles, during the most inclement season of the year. There is no necessity for such a proceeding, which inflicts needless suffering and hardship on a class of persons naturally weak and delicate, from the sedentary nature of their occupation.

The examinations thus deferred were hurriedly conducted, to make up for lost time. In January last, for instance, Mr. Kavanagh, partially aided by Mr. Coyle and myself, managed to get through the heavy business attendant on the oral examination of some 14 male teachers (principally first and second class and candidates for promotion), besides the written and oral examination of nearly 30 female teachers, all, with some few exceptions, candidates for promotion, in little more than three days. On one of these days, Wednesday, 28th, I think, he was almost entirely absent, in consequence of his attendance at the Viceroy's levee.

These examinations if properly conducted would have occupied an entire week; scarcely half that time was devoted to so important a duty. This unnecessary haste, while unjust to the teachers, entailed much additional labour and trouble on the district inspectors. We (Mr. Coyle and I) were detained by Mr. Kavanagh on the night of Friday, 31st January, in the waiting room of the Education Office, till near eight o'clock, marking the written papers, and filling up the dockets of all the female teachers belonging to my district, who had been at the examinations held on the preceding days. After this we had to classify all the male and female teachers who had attended from the same district (35), besides filling up the usual sheets for the office.

In making these remarks, I wish to convey as distinctly as possible, that, if circumstances demanded it, I would feel bound to labour in the Commissioners' service at all hours and at all seasons, wholly apart from any mean or sordid motives. Whenever called upon, I shall be found ready to respond to the call of duty, for I know that I hold a situation of very great responsibility, and that

the conscientious, efficient discharge of its duties will, sooner or later, bring honour to my humble name, and lasting benefit to my country.

This feeling should be carefully fostered and encouraged by the head inspector, both by word and example. He should not by the systematic neglect of an important duty, dishearten and annoy those whom he is bound to cheer and support.

Much that has been stated in these pages is abundantly illustrated by this case of the Talbotstown School: sure am I, for example, that the manager, Rev. Mr. Nolan, would never have penned the very disrespectful and offensive letter to the secretaries, noticed by Mr. Kavanagh, had nothing beyond a reasonable interval elapsed between the date of my interview with him in August last, and the subsequent examination of his teacher, Mary Murray.

But month after month passed away, and still nothing was heard about the examination of teachers. Nor could I even inform the Rev. Mr. Nolan when they would be held, as I have never had more than a few days' notice from Mr. Kavanagh, of the time he appoints for that duty.

In consequence of this unnecessary delay, Rev. Mr. Nolan seems to have lost all patience, and with some reason, as to the promised decision of head inspector was to all appearance indefinitely postponed. At length, however, the case comes before Mr. Kavanagh on the last days of January 1857, when Mr. Murray, with other probationary teachers, attended the annual examinations, at which it was his business to preside.

But having previously arranged to attend Lord Carlisle's levee, he was unable to remain with the teachers. Accordingly, after giving me the usual instructions for conducting the written examinations of the female teachers, and the oral examination of the male teachers then present, he made a speech, cautioning the former of the discredit and injury they would do themselves by using books, or any unfair means to aid them in answering the questions set before them. He also said something about moral influence, loss of character, honest women, wants of the country, &c.; he did not, however, it is all important to note, call in those who chanced to have books, to give them up; he said nothing whatever on that point.

His speech finished, he went home to dress for the levee, leaving me to deal singlehanded (Mr. Coyle being unwell and unable to attend during the early part of the day) with the oral examination of a number of second and some first-class teachers, and with the written examination of nearly 30 female teachers of all classes. I got through this double duty as well as I could, but it is hardly necessary to add, imperfectly and superficially, until Mr. Coyle came to my assistance, when matters proceeded somewhat better.

During Mr. Kavanagh's absence, Mary Murray, one of the teachers whom he had just addressed on the dishonesty and impropriety of using unfair means to help her in answering her written questions, was detected by me with a copy of the "Geography generalised" open in her lap, the written paper then before her being that on geography. She was the teacher of the Talbotstown Female National School, the person, in fact, already referred to. When subsequently questioned by Mr. Kavanagh, and in my presence, about this very serious charge, she admitted what, of course, she could not deny, that she had the book on her lap. She was not, however, quite certain that it was open; it might, indeed, have opened by rubbing against her clothes, but she did not herself open or read it. She admitted, however, that when I detected her with the copy of the "Geography generalised" in her lap, geography was the subject she was engaged with.

I now deliberately repeat that I saw a copy of the "Geography generalised" open on Mary Murray's lap during her written examination, held on 28th January last, the questions before her at the time being those on geography. I feel bound to add that I was, and am still, perfectly satisfied that she had the book open for the sole purpose of copying those questions into her examination paper. All this I mentioned to Mr. Kavanagh on his return from the levee.

Under ordinary circumstances, my duty was, in this case, clear enough, viz., to take up Mary Murray's papers, and then direct her to withdraw from the examination. But the case was a very peculiar one, and, as such, had come before Mr. Kavanagh for his opinion; so, I thought it more prudent to do nothing

nothing in the matter beyond taking the copy of the "Geography generalised" from her, until Mr. Kavanagh returned to the examination, when, as already stated, I brought the facts under his notice.

He soon ascertained that the book was not the property of Mary Murray, but had been lent to her by another teacher, Miss Doyle, of Drumcondra National School. Now, this circumstance in no way lessened Mary Murray's culpability. Yet, strange to say, all Mr. Kavanagh's censure fell on the unfortunate girl, Miss Doyle, who, after all, was not so much to blame, as it was quite possible she might have brought the book from home for no improper purpose; besides, she had not been called on in the morning to give up any book she had with her.

I do not mean to imply that Miss Doyle was wholly free from blame, but I say that she was far less culpable than Mary Murray, who was detected *in flagranti delicto.*

Miss Doyle, with tears in her eyes, in vain pleaded that she had not read a book of any kind during her examination, and that she was not aware of the improper use Mary Murray had been making of the geography she had lent her. But Mr. Kavanagh refused to listen to her defence; he addressed her in very strong language, in presence of the assembled teachers, males and females; adding, that he wholly discredited her statements. He finished by telling her that she should take no further part in the examination, and that any promotion she might have attained by attending at it was now lost to her.

Strange to add, Miss Doyle, notwithstanding this strong denunciation of her conduct, attended the examination next day as usual, and was, I understand, promoted, although no new fact had been elicited which could in the least diminish Mr. Kavanagh's estimate of her guilt, supposing her guilty.

But Mary Murray, the really guilty party, was in the meanwhile allowed to pass comparatively free of blame or censure; her written paper was not taken from her, nor was she in any way punished by Mr. Kavanagh, who states, oddly enough, in his letter of 31st January, "The question we had to discuss was, should she (Mary Murray) not be placed, relatively to all our other divisions, on first division of third class?"

I leave it to Mr. Kavanagh to reconcile this opinion with his remarks to the teachers, on the first morning of their examination, about character, honesty, moral influence, &c. To me they seem wholly incompatible. I shall merely add, that the facts now correctly detailed may have led the teachers present at the examination to conclude that Mr. Kavanagh had shown undue favour and partiality to the girl Murray: on that point I give no opinion; it will of course be for the Commissioners to decide whether there are sufficient grounds to support such a conclusion.

I have now finished my account of what really occurred with reference to this case of the Talbotstown Female National School, and I have endeavoured to supply, by a clear, unvarnished statement of facts, for the omissions and inaccuracies in Mr. Kavanagh's letter (31/1/57) to the secretaries, condemnatory of my official conduct in the matter. I deeply regret that he has deemed it necessary to censure the course I pursued, as I have been at all times desirous to gain the favourable opinion of my superior officer by a correct discharge of my official duties.

In this case, however, I think there is not any reasonable ground of complaint against me, for I am in a position to indicate some serious misstatements and suppression of facts in Mr. Kavanagh's letter, referred to above, which invalidate the charges he has preferred against me.

I may here premise, that Mr. Kavanagh has derived his information on the case from my observations to him about it, from my reports on the Talbotstown Female National School, and, finally, from a short conversation he had with Mary Murray in my presence and that of Mr. Coyle, district inspector. He also read a scurrilous letter from Rev Mr. Nolan (26/1/57), preferring sundry petty charges against me, but which had nothing to do with the main facts of the case. He refers to another communication of Rev. Mr. Nolan's, the substance of which he incorrectly quotes (paragraph 2, page 2, of his letter).

It now remains for me to point out the misstatements, &c., referred to in last page of this communication.

1. Mr. Kavanagh suppresses the important fact that my recommendation for the withdrawal of salary from Mary Murray was made principally on the ground of her extreme youth and inexperience of school-keeping: this fact gives an entirely different aspect to the case as stated by him, and renders it almost unnecessary to enter into any lengthened notice of his remaining statements. I shall, however, produce evidence from my reports which places that point beyond the reach of doubt.

I wrote in my report (20/3/56), "Mary Murray's method of conducting unsatisfactory; wholly unfitted, from extreme youth, inexperience, and want of adequate literary acquirements." Upon this last point I insisted but little, as I believed the other reasons assigned were sufficient to call for her removal. This view is fully borne out by a second paragraph in the same report: "The manager of this school will not remove Mary Murray unless called upon by the Board to do so. This interference is, however, very necessary, as I believe the interests of the school will be sacrificed should so young and inexperienced a person be permitted to remain in charge of it: this is also the opinion of the resident Roman Catholic curate." I expressly added, that I did not then test her literary acquirements, as I had a tolerably correct idea of what they were from previous examination. If she had shown the slightest aptitude for the business of teaching, or if her method of conducting and examining a class had indicated even a probability of future fitness, it would, I admit, have been a most unjust and blameable proceeding on my part to have recommended her removal without previous examination of her literary acquirements. I hardly think, however, that the youngest sub-inspector in the Board's service would act so foolishly.

But I saw that she was quite unsuited, from want of method and experience, for the responsible situation she attempted to fill; I saw that she had no more notion of school keeping than the children she professed to teach; I saw that she was only the nominal teacher of the school, qualifying under Anne Goss, expelled for theft from the training institution, and therefore I recommended her removal.

The whole case hinges on this consideration, which is, however, altogether ignored by Mr. Kavanagh in his letter (31/1/57) to the Commissioners, probably because he had never examined Mary Murray's school, nor had even heard her examine a class, which would have answered nearly as well. He ought, I respectfully suggest, have done so before he charged me with unjustly "depriving her of her bread."

This is abundantly obvious from the extracts already given from my reports on the Talbotstown Female National School. Other passages occur in those reports which fully support the same view. One will, perhaps, suffice: in reply to query 40 in report 13/8/56, I state, "Mary Murray not recognised by the Board, salary having been withdrawn on my report of March last, on the ground that she was unqualified, from inexperience, to take charge of a national school." Mr. Kavanagh was fully cognisant of all that has been just mentioned, and yet he charges me with a want of common sense, with injustice, and a breach of the code, for having omitted to test, by special examination, Mary Murray's literary acquirements. He appears to forget, leaving every other reason out of consideration, that he had in February 1856, in the case of Anne Salmon, probationary teacher of the Wicklow Female National School, sanctioned precisely the same course he now appears to regard as repugnant to common sense and justice.

In both cases I recommended the teacher's removal, mainly and principally on the ground of want of method and experience, and without any previous examination of the teacher's literary acquirements.

Such palpable inconsistency must seriously impede all satisfactory co-operation between Mr. Kavanagh and the district inspectors under his superintendence, since we must always be in doubt respecting his views of official business, when we find him blaming to-day the very course he sanctioned but yesterday.

The average attendance at the Wicklow Female National School for the year ended 31st December 1855 was 64; that in the Talbotstown Female National School

School for the year ended 30th November 1855, 27; the former being a town and the latter a rural school. That circumstance, however, in no way affects the main question at issue: "Is it under any circumstances justifiable for an inspector to recommend the removal of a probationary teacher without first testing his or her literary acquirements?"

Most unquestionably the inspector's usual and proper course is to examine the probationary teachers before recommending their removal. But if the inspector have other and sufficient grounds for taking that step, the test of literary acquirements is not then required.

The Wicklow case is, I think, illustrative of my meaning, for I again recommend A. Salmon's removal after her general examination, which Mr. Kavanagh conducted in February 1856. Although she had acquitted herself very creditably, her general answering being fully equal to second division of second class; she was, however, required to resign, simply because, like Mary Murray, she was not qualified, from inexperience and want of method, to take the charge of a national school.

I may, perhaps, be wrong in holding these opinions. If so, I can only say that Mr. Kavanagh's approval of my conduct in the Wicklow case most undoubtedly led me to believe, that in pursuing a similar course of action when dealing with the Talbotstown teacher I was acting in accordance with his views and in a manner to gain his approbation.

2. Mr. Kavanagh states, page 2d of his letter, "On perusing the report (20/3/56) it will be seen that several circumstances, as the opinions of managers, curate, those of a farmer, Anne Goss, residing with Mary Murray's family, &c., are brought in to support Mr. Fleming's recommendation."

It is utterly untrue that I had an interview or communication of any kind, verbal or written, with a "farmer" on the subject of the Talbotstown Female National School, or the teacher's removal therefrom, and that I urged his opinions in my report, 20/3/56, to support my recommendation, &c. I might reasonably have hoped that the character I have fairly earned during the past ten years for a correct knowledge and efficient discharge of my official duties would have protected me from this very queer remark of Mr. Kavanagh. I beg to say, I never held council with any farmer or farmers as to the qualifications of any teacher under my superintendence. A glance at the report quoted by Mr. Kavanagh will at once demonstrate that this statement of his about "a farmer's opinions, &c.," has not a shadow of any kind of proof to support it.

3. Again, it is not the fact that I urged the circumstance of Anne Goss's residence with Mary Murray's family, to support my recommendation for Mary Murray's removal from the Talbotstown National School. I merely stated in my report, 20/3/56, to which Mr. Kavanagh alludes, that "Anne Goss (whose character is anything but good) resides and boards in the family of Mary Murray, whose father is a small farmer, and who, I believe, makes her some return for her aid in getting his daughter appointed to the school."

I felt bound to notice this circumstance in accordance with the instructions in the code requiring the inspector to ascertain and make known any facts illustrative of the teacher's habits, manner of life, &c., which he may deem worthy of remark. But I never urged it as a reason for Mary Murray's removal. On the contrary, I mentioned in my report of 13/8/56, as one of my reasons for recommending her to be continued as temporary teacher until her case should come before the head inspector, that "she had much improved in method since last inspection; she has been much assisted by the former teacher, A. Goss) dismissed for theft from the Training Institution, December last) in conducting the business of the school since my last visit. She has by this means greatly improved in method; for A. Goss, her instructor, although unprincipled and dishonest, is sharp and clever, and understands pretty well how a school should be conducted."

I knew very well that Anne Goss was at the time boarding or lodging with Mary Murray's family, but it never occurred to me to represent that circumstance as a reason in any way tending to support my recommendation for Mary Murray's removal. Mr. Kavanagh's statement to the contrary is quite incompatible with the tone and wording of all my reports on the Talbotstown Female National School. I respectfully invite a perusal of those documents, as

I feel assured they will corroborate to the fullest extent every word of what I have just written.

4. Mr. Kavanagh says, para. 2, page 2 of his letter, that the manager, Rev. Mr. Nolan, in his letter to the Commissioners, after salary had been withdrawn from M. Murray on my report (20/3/56), "urged various reasons of a peculiarly local nature in favour of her retention in her situation." Did Mr. Kavanagh ever see this letter of Rev. Mr. Nolan? I think not.

I have a copy of that letter now before me, which I forward with this communication for the information of the Commissioners. Rev. Mr. Nolan states in this letter of his, referred to by Mr. Kavanagh: "The untenable grounds for his (inspector's) judgment, and my reasons for differing with him (inspector) shall if necessary be stated on another occasion." Thus, Mr. Kavanagh's account of what Rev. Mr. Nolan wrote is the very reverse of what the reverend gentleman really did write. A glance at the annexed copy of Rev. Mr. Nolan's letter will suffice to show the perfect accuracy of this statement, and that it is in no respect an exaggeration.

5. Mr. Kavanagh mentions in 2d paragraph, 4th page of his letter, "Mr. Fleming visited in August 1856, when he strongly urged that the manager's application be granted; and singularly he again infers her qualifications, and recommending her removal without examination, he again recommends further trial without examination either, nor does he make a single entry in the observation book, which would explain the change of opinion to his successor."

I beg to call special attention to the words underlined in the preceding paragraph, and I ask Mr. Kavanagh upon what grounds he makes the assertion that "not a single entry was made by me in the observation book which would explain the change of opinion to my successor."

How does Mr. Kavanagh know that? He never visited the Talbotstown schools, nor did he ever see the observation books of those schools; not even a copy of my remarks left in the observation books had come under his eye. He had heard nothing of the matter from or through the manager, as admitted by himself in the very last line of his letter (31/1/57) to the secretaries. He got no information of the kind from me, for I could tell him nothing about what I had written in the observation book of the Talbotstown School (or in any other school, indeed) from memory alone, on the mere spur of the moment, and without reference to my note book, or some other written document connected with the case.

I say nothing of the teacher, because being the party immediately concerned, any statement made by her in her own case should be supported by some correlative evidence before being embodied in the shape of a charge of neglect of duty against me. I do not mean to imply that Mr. Kavanagh has preferred a serious charge against me solely on the unsupported statement of a teacher, for I can hardly suppose that a person in so high a position in the service of the Board could so far forget his sense of justice and fair dealing as to deliberately try to injure the character of his fellow officer on mere rumours or one-sided reports, supposing such to have been made.

Still the question recurs, from what sources did Mr. Kavanagh obtain his information, so as to be in a position to give his opinion without any doubt, ifs, or hesitation respecting a document which he never saw, and about which, as I have shown, he really knew nothing whatever?

I respectfully request the Commissioners will call on Mr. Kavanagh to answer my last question, and also to reply to the paragraphs in this document headed with the figures 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

I await his explanation, from which I fear nothing. He is, meanwhile, in a very unenviable position in consequence of the way he has been pleased to deal with this Talbotstown case. It pains me to make this avowal, but I feel bound to do so in defence of my official character, which is everything to me, and which has, I think, been unfairly and unnecessarily censured by Mr. Kavanagh.

He is apparently very desirous to protect the interests of qualified probationary teachers "against hastily-framed opinions, which may degrade them, and deprive them of their bread." I sincerely hope that he will be animated by this very just and proper feeling in all his future official intercourse with the district

district inspectors, for they, too, may be injured by "hastily framed opinions," which, if allowed to pass unnoticed, might possibly lower them in the estimation of the Commissioners, and thereby deprive them of the promotion fairly earned by long and efficient service.

One more instance of Mr. Kavanagh's looseness of statement, and I have done with him. He mentions, that Mary Murray was in this case "deprived of her bread," in consequence of my neglect, &c. Now, this is merely figurative speech; dealing with facts, it has no meaning. Mary Murray was not deprived of her bread, nor even of the price of a single loaf through my means, and Mr. Kavanagh knew that perfectly well when he was writing the letter to which I now reply. He and I had already signed the classification sheet recommending restoration of salary to Mary Murray, as probationer, from 31 May 1856, the date from which her salary had been withdrawn, till 1st January 1857, from which latter date she was to be recognised and paid as 3d class. We both understood that this joint recommendation would, as a matter of course, be acted upon in the office, which I need scarcely add, it was; B. O. 26/2/57.

Mary Murray suffered a loss, I admit, in having her salary withheld for nearly three quarters, but that loss is entirely attributable to Mr. Kavanagh's neglect and unnecessary delay in holding the teachers' examinations; had those examinations been held in August or September (as they ought, and might have been), Mary Murray would have received her salary in due course, and the matter would have been arranged to the satisfaction of all parties.

I have now completed my reply to Mr. Kavanagh's charges against me so far as the Talbotstown case is concerned, and I sincerely hope the Commissioners will deem my explanation satisfactory; it differs, however, very widely from that attributed to me by Mr. Kavanagh, when he writes (last paragraph in page two of his letter): "Mr. Fleming's explanation is, that he had examined her in class as a pupil in August 1855, and from this and what he witnessed in the school, he felt warranted in declaring her incompetency." The words "what he witnessed in the school," may mean a great deal or they may mean very little; as interpreted by me, they convey much more than what they apparently express in Mr. Kavanagh's letter.

But I had no official explanation with Mr. Kavanagh on the subject. We had, I perfectly remember, a hurried conversation during an interval at the teachers' examinations, held on 29th and 30th January last, on Mary Murray's case, in her presence and that of my fellow inspector, Mr. Coyle. No reference was made at the time to my reports, notes, or written documents of any kind. Mr. Kavanagh subsequently looked over my reports on the Talbotstown Female National School, to which I requested he would be good enough to refer.

I had no idea what his object was in questioning me on the case; had I known that it was to end in his preferring serious charges against me, I would most assuredly have taken a very different course with him; but he never intimated to me anything of the kind until he elicited all the information, such as it was, that I was able to give him from mere memory, about Mary Murray and her case.

How far such a course of proceeding is consistent with honourable, manly, and straightforward dealing, I leave it to the Commissioners to decide.

I have further to complain that Mr. Kavanagh persevered in questioning me and the teacher, Mary Murray, in turn (confronting us, as it were), and all this in presence of my brother inspector, Mr. Coyle, to whom, indeed, he had the bad taste to hand for perusal a scurrilous and offensive letter from Rev. Mr. Nolan, attacking in no very measured terms my honour and character. I told Mr. Kavanagh when he first began what afterwards proved, to my surprise, to be an official investigation, that I had no objection to Mr. Coyle's presence, as I had then no idea that the affair was about to assume a serious aspect, or that my mere verbal statements, given at hazard and from memory alone, would in a day or two be brought to support serious charges against myself.

Meanwhile I am unable to conceive for what object Mr. Kavanagh has improvised an investigation (for such he seems to regard it) of a case which I was the first to bring specially under his attention in September 1856, and again in January last, when the teachers met him for examination. Indeed, but for my observations to him about the matter, it would, in all probability, have passed without any special notice or remark.

I certainly thought the difficulty, such as it was, would have been quietly settled by Mr. Kavanagh, who must have been aware that my conduct in the business was all through honourable and straightforward, and that, distrusting my own judgment, I very properly brought the case before him for his opinion and final decision.

Perhaps I took an erroneous view of the case; even so, I was at the most guilty of one of those errors of judgment to which the most prudent and cautious are occasionally liable; but that certainly afforded Mr. Kavanagh no grounds for preferring a string of charges against me.

I now appeal from his inaccurate and *ex parte* statements to the judgment of the Commissioners, who will, I feel assured, protect their servants from inconsiderate and unfounded statements, no matter from what quarter they may originate.

In making these remarks I beg most respectfully to add, that I am thoroughly impressed with the conviction that every rule of official action requires courtesy, willing obedience, and a hearty, earnest co-operation from the inferior officer in all his intercourse with his superior in station and responsibility. I feel sincere pleasure in being able to state that I have always been fortunate enough to earn the esteem and good opinion of the several head inspectors under whose superintendence I have been placed; Mr. Kavanagh is the only and exceptional case to the contrary during an official career of nearly 11 years as district inspector.

I may here add, that the annexed note from Rev. Mr. Nolan shows that he entertains no unfriendly or unfavourable feelings towards me. He and I honestly differed about his teachers' qualifications, but that difference of opinion never interfered with the courteous and friendly feeling which has ever existed between us from the time I first made his acquaintance. I am aware he wrote a very foolish letter to the Commissioners regarding Mary Murray's examination, in January last, but I have reason to know that he now regrets having done so. "No man is wise at all hours," and some allowance must be made for a temperament somewhat hasty and irritated by what certainly appeared to be a grievance.

Mr. Kavanagh's apprehension that "the Talbotstown case," must interfere with "the efficient discharge of Mr. Fleming's duty in that quarter (Carlow) of the district," is, I beg to assure the Commissioners, wholly groundless.

Before concluding this communication, I have to observe that the remarks made by Mr. Kavanagh in the last paragraph but one of his letter, which I enclose herewith, being in no way connected with the Talbotstown case, necessarily demand from me a special and distinct reply. That reply, with the observation books of the schools named by Mr. Kavanagh, will be submitted by me, with all possible despatch, for the information of the Board.

I feel bound to apologise for not having sooner forwarded this reply to Mr. Kavanagh's communication; my yearly report, examination of teachers, and other urgent official business, occupied most of my time during the last six weeks. The very lengthened nature of my reply also demanded a good deal of my time and attention.

These circumstances will, I trust, be received at least as some excuse for the delay in this case.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *J. J. Fleming*,
District Inspector, 35.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

Gentlemen, Rathdrum, 30 April 1857.

I BEG you will be good enough to direct that the last paragraph but one in Mr. Kavanagh's communication, bearing date 31st January last, may be forwarded to me as soon as possible.

In the paragraph referred to, I am severely censured by Mr. Kavanagh for the unconnected nature of my remarks in the observation books of many of the schools under my superintendence. It will be necessary for me to have a copy of the paragraph referred to above, as I am required by you to reply to Mr. Kavanagh's statements. I regret giving trouble on this matter, and feel bound

to

to apologise for so doing, as having had Mr. Kavanagh's letter in my hands for a considerable time, I could very easily have made a copy of the passages in it, which I now so much require. In the hurry of posting my reply to the first part of that letter, I entirely forgot to do so, and hence I am obliged to intrude on your kindness to have a copy of the last two paragraphs forwarded to me at your earliest convenience.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *J. G. Fleming*,
District Inspector.

The Secretaries,
Education Office.

(35.)

Sir, Education Office, 7 May 1857.

As requested by your communication of the 30th ultimo, we transmit you a copy of latter portion of Mr. Head Inspector Kavanagh's letter of the 31st January. Extract attached.

We are, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross*,
J. Kelly, Secretaries.

John G. Fleming, Esq.
District Inspector, Rathdrum.

Gentlemen, Rathdrum, 29 May 1857.

I BEG to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 7th instant, with copy of latter portion of Mr. Head Inspector Kavanagh's letter of 31st January last, enclosed.

Mr. Kavanagh states in this concluding paragraph of his communication "I may here add that I had in autumn last to call Mr. Fleming's attention to some serious instances, somewhat similar to this, in which he expressed himself in the strongest and most decided terms in the observation books, as to the unfitness of teachers; and in his next or subsequent reports in the book, the same parties being in charge of the schools, no explanation whatever is put forward to account for the change of opinion. The cases of the worst kind are Corrigowen (12/6/55), and Barreneskey (18/12/55.)" As it will be necessary for me to enter fully into the details of the Corrigowen and Barreneskey schools, before concluding this communication, I shall now proceed to notice the general charge preferred against me by Mr. Kavanagh, of using the strongest and most decided terms in the observation books of some of the National Schools under my superintendence, regarding the unfitness of teachers, although in subsequent visits, the same teachers being in charge of the schools, no remark is made by me explanatory of any change of opinion on my part.

I beg to assure the Commissioners in the most distinct and explicit terms which the strictness of official language permits me to use, that apart from the Corrigowen and Barreneskey schools, Mr. Kavanagh never called my attention, either directly or indirectly, by verbal or written communication of any kind, to a single instance in which I employed "the most decided language, regarding the unfitness of teachers in the observation books, but passed over the matter on next and subsequent visits in utter silence, the same teachers being in charge of the schools."

This statement is strictly correct: and until Mr. Kavanagh names the other cases to which he refers, the matter is, I respectfully submit, at an end so far as I am concerned. I think it right to add that I purposely deferred replying to this portion of Mr. Kavanagh's letter, until I made myself quite certain of the facts of each case, by an actual inspection of the observation books in all the schools which he inspected in this district. I am, therefore, in a position to state, with the most perfect confidence, that those other cases of want of connexion, &c., in my entries in the observation books, to which Mr. Kavanagh refers, have no existence whatever in fact.

I, therefore, respectfully request that Mr. Kavanagh may be called on to specify those cases to which he states he called my attention in autumn last; failing to do so, his serious charge against me, of course, falls to the ground.

Let him then name any school to which he believes his strictures on my official conduct apply, and I shall, after very little delay, forward the observation book of that school to the office, in order that the Commissioners may at once see whether there are any grounds for the serious charge now preferred against me by Mr. Kavanagh.

I am most anxious to submit the case to this strict and fair test, for it is a hard thing, after a lengthened period of 11 years in the Board's service, to suffer from unsustained and groundless charges, now for the first time preferred against me, but which, I repeat, have no foundation in fact.

With reference to the cases specially mentioned by Mr. Kavanagh, viz., Corrigowen and Barreneskey, I feel it my duty to forward the observation books on those schools to the office, with the view of placing the facts connected with each case, in the clearest possible light before the Commissioners,

I visited the Corrigowen National School, for the first time, on 12th June 1855, James Davis being the teacher in charge. He was but 18 years of age, and a probationer, and as his school had not been visited by any inspector since October 1854, he came before me for the first time as a teacher.

I found him very deficient in literary acquirements, but as he appeared steady, intelligent, and anxious to improve, I decided upon allowing him to remain on trial until he attended the usual annual examinations, which were held in the following month of March. In short, I gave him to understand that unless he succeeded by persevering study to pass his public examination, he could not be sanctioned as qualified to conduct a National School.

I thought it necessary to make an entry to that effect in the observation book, after my inspection, 12/6/55, in order that the teacher, Davis, who was a very young man, might have constantly before his eyes the deep importance of paying the strictest attention to his studies.

I have merely to add that the matter necessarily remained in abeyance until the Head Inspector and myself had decided upon this teacher's examination papers and general answering, with a view to his classification or rejection, as the case might be. As this final decision had not taken place up to the date of Mr. Kavanagh's visit to the Corrigowen National School in August last, he consequently found no further remarks in the observation book regarding the teacher's acquirements, simply because the man's case was then pending.

He was, in fact, a probationary teacher allowed to remain on trial, and I was bound to suspend my judgment until his examination had taken place. Such cases, which are of frequent occurrence in every school district, are not, I believe, in any way incompatible with the rules and regulations of the Commissioners.

Barreneskey, the second case specially mentioned in Mr. Kavanagh's communication of 31st January last, now remains to be explained.

I visited that school on the 18th December 1855, on which occasion there were but few children present; I could not, therefore, form any opinion regarding the general proficiency of the teacher's pupils; but "finding the schoolroom, in point of neatness, cleanliness, &c., if possible in a worse state than at last inspection, the school accounts carelessly and negligently kept, and the suggestions left on those heads wholly neglected by the teacher (D. Phelan), I concluded by recommending the manager to remove him in consequence of his indolence and inefficiency."

I read over my observations (18/12/55) for the teacher's information before leaving his school. He admitted there were some grounds for the unfavourable tenor of my remarks; but he earnestly requested a further trial. The poor man had just lost his only son, who had been carried off by scarlatina: and he stated that his faculties had been so stunned by his sudden bereavement that he found it impossible to attend to the usual business of his school.

On hearing this, I requested him to accompany me to the manager's residence in order that his case might be fully discussed. We accordingly called on the manager, Rev. Mr. Kearney, who was fortunately at home. I then preferred my charge of slovenly conduct, carelessness, &c. against the teacher in presence of the manager. The teacher's reply was patiently listened to, and, I am bound to add, many, indeed most, of his statements were corroborated by the Rev. Mr. Kearney, who candidly gave it as his opinion that there were some mitigatory circumstances in Phelan's (the teacher) case, which fairly entitled him to a further trial before recommending his final removal from the Barreneskey National School.

He

He was, therefore, dismissed with an admonitory caution to pay the strictest attention to the suggestions left for his guidance. This he promised to do, and there the matter ended so far as regarded my visit of 18th December 1855.

I again inspected the Barreneskey National School on 12th June 1856, when the manager kindly attended at my special request, that he might see how far the school had improved, and to what extent the teacher had attended to former suggestions. The children were very minutely examined on this occasion, the accounts were subjected to the strictest scrutiny, and every point requiring especial attention was minutely investigated.

I summed up my report (on a primary form) of this inspection by stating that " this school was unfavourably reported upon after last and previous visit. I believe, however, that the teacher has made some exertions to remedy the defects brought under his attention. He is a person of very little energy, and wants method. The small average attendance is, in some measure, owing to the mountainous and isolated nature of the country in the immediate neighbourhood of the school."

These remarks were of an unfavourable character, and implied censure rather than praise; but, on the other hand, as some efforts had been made to remove existing defects, I was unwilling to damp future exertions on the part of the teacher, by making any very unfavourable entries in the observation book, after my inspection of the 12th June 1856. This arrangement had the manager's entire approbation, as he conceived it to be the most prudent that could be adopted under the circumstances. The accompanying note, which he kindly wrote me at my request, fully explains his views of the case.

I cannot say whether Mr. Kavanagh got any information from the manager and teacher of the Barreneskey National School regarding the facts which I have just stated. It would appear, however, from the tenor of the remarks in his reports on the Barreneskey and Corrigowen National Schools that he did not, when penning those documents, view my official conduct in connexion with those schools, in an unfavourable light; for I never received official intimation, consequent on any of Mr. Kavanagh's reports, of the very serious fault of making inconsistent and apparently contradictory entries in any one of the observation books of the schools in the Wicklow district visited by him. His replies to the query in his (Head Inspector's form of report) " Are district Inspector's suggestions pertinent?" must consequently have been in the affirmative, and therefore satisfactory.

I beg that special reference may be made to these reports of Mr. Kavanagh's on the Barreneskey and Corrigowen National Schools, but more particularly to the query, " Are inspectors suggestions pertinent?" If (as I am sure must be the case) his replies to that query, in August or September last, were of a satisfactory nature, it seems very strange that on the 31st January last, he should regard those suggestions as inconsistent and wanting connexion.

I may add, that I got letters from the secretaries regarding a slight discrepancy in the time-table of the Annacarter National School, the delay in distributing the new forms of report book, &c., absence of a copy of the general lesson in the Newtown Mount Kennedy National School, and many other official letters on minor matters of detail connected with my duties of inspection. Now all those communications arose out of statements in Mr. Kavanagh's reports upon schools in this district; but I never got any official intimation of the far more serious omission of duty referred to by Mr. Kavanagh in the concluding paragraphs of his communication to the secretaries of 31st January last.

If such instances of omission really existed, why, I respectfully ask, did Mr. Kavanagh defer noticing them officially until 31st January last, and then only in the latter portion of a lengthened communication upon a totally different subject. With this final observation, I beg to leave my case in the hands of the Commissioners.

I remain, &c.

The Secretaries,
Education Office.

(signed) *J. G. Fleming,*
Dist. Insp. (35).

Sir, Education Office, 3 July 1857.

YOUR letter of the 31st January last, charging Mr. Fleming, District Inspector, with neglect of duty, &c., having been forwarded to him for explanation, he has sent us two communications on the subject of those charges, copies of which we enclose for your perusal.

You are requested to furnish, at your earliest convenience, any remarks which you may think it your duty to make, in reference to the explanation afforded by him.

We are, &c.

(signed) *Maurice Cross*, } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

District 35.—*J. G. Fleming*, Esq., District Inspector.

Talbotstown Female National School, Roll No. , County Wicklow.

CASE of Mary Murray, teacher of this school, reported by Inspector as too young, and otherwise unsuited for her station; salary withdrawn from her by Board's Order on this Report; Manager's remonstrance against Order; matter is referred to Inspector for reconsideration; Inspector recommends trial to Teacher till District Examination of Teachers; Teacher is examined by Head Inspector (Mr. Kavanagh), and District Inspector Mr. Fleming, who both concur in recommending her for Probation's salary from the date of its suspension, and for third class (second division) salary, from the month in which examination was held.

Gentlemen,

I BEG leave to state that the examination of Miss Murray above referred to, took place at the end of last January, with the teachers' examination of the district. Immediately after the examination, I forwarded a letter of complaint, founded upon the case; March 2d, Mr. Fleming was apprised of this complaint; his reply thereto, now before me, is dated April 24th, and a subsequent portion of it May 29th, and after the lapse of five months I am now called upon to notice Mr. Fleming's explanation, in reference to the simple complaint set forth in my letter of January 31st last. In his letter of April 24th, Mr. Fleming very correctly describes the substantive character of my complaint against him, "as an omission of duty on his part in recommending Mary Murray, teacher of the Talbotstown Female National School, to be removed for incompetency, without first ascertaining by examination the extent of her literary attainments," (page 1, Mr. Fleming's letter 24/4/57).

I have carefully perused the 35 pages of explanation in reference to this case, so clearly stated by Mr. Fleming himself, as just quoted, and the following are the only points in it which require, or even suggest, any comment on my part.

Page 7, Mr. Fleming states, "It is all important to observe that there were three distinct reasons urged in his (Mr. F.'s) report (20/3/56,) for the teacher's removal:—1st. Extreme youth. 2nd. Total inexperience of school keepings. 3d. Want of adequate literary attainments. He (Mr. Fleming) stated in his report that he did not, at the time, test her literary acquirements. Why? Because he was perfectly satisfied that the other two reasons alleged were quite sufficient in warranting him to recommend her removal." Perhaps I should close, and offer no comment on the admission, and the motive, set forth under the third head. The drift of my complaint is, that Mr. Fleming found Mary Murray acting as substitute teacher when he visited, November 1855; that he found her actual teacher when he visited March 1856; that on neither occasion did he examine as to her literary attainments; that upon his report of the latter visit he had her removed, amongst other grounds, upon want of acquirements which he admits he did not test; and finally, that on the manager protesting against the Board's decision, or rather against the grounds upon which it

it was made.* Mr. Fleming again visited in August last, and without any examination as to her attainments, recommends that the teacher get trial until the district examination of the teachers.

If an officer makes a mistake, or falls into an error of judgment, even in a very serious matter, at least when confessing it he has opportunity, if a frank and straightforward man, of candidly, and without gloss, putting the higher part of his character in a creditable position. Mr. Fleming adverts to three distinct reasons urged by him for the removal of the teacher, and he states that it is all important these three should be kept in mind. Page 14, Mr. Fleming states that he was under the impression when he visited the Talbotstown Female National School, August 13th last, that the case of Mary Murray would come before me at the examination of the teachers of the district, "which he very naturally expected would be held in that month, or at farthest in September;" and this he assigns as the chief, or at least as an important ground, for his recommendation to give Mary Murray further trial, and without examination as to her acquirements.

The chief, almost the only thing, which the expected examination could test, is acquirements, and I presume Mr. Fleming, as a first class inspector, will not deny that he is competent to inquire into, and report upon, unaided by even a Head Inspector, a young woman's literary fitness to get trial as a probationer in charge of a rural National School in a mountain district. Her age could not be affected, beyond a month, by the examination and her inexperience of school-keeping, the last of the three grounds of removal would be in the same category. As to her age, numbers younger have been trained and are highly classed, and some teachers, very little her seniors, have got charge of model schools; as to inexperience it simply means that it is the first school of which she has been placed in charge, and if this were urged generally it would be self-destructive of the institution, or else† teachers, as such, should not merely be immortal but eternal. In her instance she has been wholly brought up in a National School, and as Mr. Fleming himself admits, under a very clever, although an otherwise improper person, as teacher.

It pains me beyond expression to be obliged to lay bare before the Commissioners the utterly uncandid, to use the mildest form of word, conduct of Mr. Fleming in reference to the time when he expected the examination of the teachers of his district to be held. The written portion of the male teachers' examination for 1856 was held in Easter week, commencing March 24th, and instructions were issued to all the inspectors, to furnish the papers, returns, &c. within a couple of weeks of that date. In July, instead of April, I received Mr. Fleming's men's papers, and in such a state of arrears, untidiness and neglect, that on the 11th July I wrote to him, imforming him that I regretted to be obliged to return them to him that the proper forms might be complied with. To this letter I have now before me his reply, dated "Delgany, 14 July 1856," in which he states, "I regret you should find it necessary to be obliged to return me the teachers' papers, in order to have the results of the answering transferred to the back of the dockets. This shall be done with as little delay as possible. * * * * * It shall be my special care to relieve you from the trouble of sending me any such communication of a similar nature" (letter in reference to this and other omissions of duty) "henceforth." In that letter he also stated that I should have got the men's exercises much earlier, as he had forwarded them to the office nearly a month before; but, in reference to this statement, I found, in one of his official note-books, a memorandum to write same; officially to hold over the exercises, for some reason, after they had been sent to the office. August 15th, or two days after his inspection of Talbotstown Female National School, Mr. Fleming again wrote to me from Baltinglass, in reply to my letter of the 9th of the same month, in reference to the men's exercises, and stated, "With regard to the teachers' written papers, which you desire to forward to me in order to have dockets filled up, I greatly fear that if sent

* Reverend Mr. Nowlan (11/6/56) informs the Board that he differs *toto cœlo* with Mr. Fleming; states that she is competent; and requests that Mr. Molley, inspector of next district, should be called in to examine and report upon the case.

† Would Mr. Fleming, when a candidate inspector, like to have been ejected without trial or inquiry, as to his literary attainments, total inexperience as an inspector disqualifying him?

sent here, *viâ* Dublin and Baltinglass, they may be lost or mislaid. I may add, that in no other way could the papers be forwarded to me (here) than by Dublin; you will, therefore, much oblige me by holding over those papers for a few days, after which I hope to see you in Graystones, where I shall put all to rights."*

From these letters of his, dated July 14th and August 15th, I believe there can be no shadow of a doubt, that when he had the interview with the Rev. Mr. Nowlan, on the occasion of his visit to Talbotstown Female National School, on the 13th August, he did not expect that the examinations would be held in August. When does Mr. Fleming arrive in Graystones to put all (the papers) to rights?—September 5th. The first time that I met him since my arrival in the district, July 31st; and I got the papers filled by Mr. Fleming so late, that it was only on October 2d (*see* my journal) that I was able to read over the results of the examination with him, with a view to decide on who were to be recalled to the oral examination.

Nor is this all. Towards the close of my stay in the district, Mr. Fleming was in the habit of daily travel and intercourse with me, and on mentioning to him that I was inclined to call in the teachers of some of the districts adjoining Dublin, as all my colleagues had been in the habit of doing, but which I had not, with the view to examination, and as this could best be done about the Christmas holidays,† he expressed a wish that those of his district should be included, and to which I agreed. About the 6th January Mr. Fleming and Mr. Coyle were absent from their districts, in reference to the marriage of the former, and, to meet the occasion, I went to Connaught to examine, and postponed the metropolitan examination. January 19th, I addressed a letter to Mr. Fleming in reference to the examination, and, as he had changed his position since his previously expressed wish to have the examination in Dublin, I left the place of its being held to his own option, thus, "I am not yet decided as to whether to summon your teachers with those of the North Dublin District or not; the former was your wish, and would be more convenient, but perhaps such a course, now, would not so well suit you. Let me hear from you first post." Mr. Fleming decided on having his teachers examined in town, where he himself was then staying in lodgings near Portobello; and, instead of going off to Wicklow at expense, he remained in Dublin at 7*s.* 6*d.* per day, and this is a portion of his own privation in reference to the postponement of the examination.

I submit this statement in reference to the question of the time and place of holding the examination of the teachers, and, supported as it is by documentary evidence, I shall offer no comment upon the matter.

I beg, however, to add another statement regarding the time and the place of holding the examination of Mr. Fleming's teachers. About the 1st January I heard that Mr. Fleming had mentioned in the Education Office that it was not then the examination should be held, and on meeting him in the grounds, in the presence of another gentleman, I mentioned to him what I had heard, and in reply he said he had no recollection of having so complained or expressed himself. I told him, that "If he had it would be not only untruthful but ungrateful, as the examination was about to be held in the place desired by him, and at the time agreed upon." And upon this, he remarked, "You certainly did promise to bring the teachers here about the vacation to oblige me, and if I complained, as you were informed, it would be both untruthful and ungrateful."

Reviewing this portion of the case, Mr. Fleming fully admits the main complaint which I put forward against him, that of not examining, as prescribed by the inspector's code, Mary Murray, on any of the three occasions upon which he visited and reported upon herself and her school. Salary was withdrawn from her upon one of these reports, and she was restored, upon trial, through

* Still more remarkable in that letter of August 15, written two days after his inspection of Talbotstown Female National School, Mr. Fleming never refers to the case, nor informs me that he had used my name to the manager, nor of his desire to have the examination held soon, in order to have the case settled, although much of the letter is devoted to the discussion of the answering of the male teachers, the examination, &c.

† As Messrs. Butler and McCreedy had done in Dublin in previous year, Dr. Newell in Cork, &c.

through another report, yet in no instance did the inspector examine as to her literary acquirements. Mr. Fleming turns round, and, while admitting, but attempting to excuse or explain, this serious omission of a most important duty, actually endeavours to implicate me, accusing me of neglect, delay, and irregularity in various particulars. Thus, page 31, he states:—"Mary Murray suffered a loss, I admit, in having her salary withheld for nearly three quarters, but that loss is entirely attributable to Mr. Kavanagh's neglect and unnecessary delay in holding the teachers' examinations. Had these examinations been held in August or September (as they ought and might have been), Mary Murray would have received her salary in due course, and the matter would have been arranged to the satisfaction of all parties."

I have now to state that I first heard of Mary Murray's case in a passing conversation when driving on a car to inspect schools with Mr. Fleming, either September 23d or 24th; from neither official nor private parties had I ever before heard anything about her, her school, or her manager,* beyond any routine matter that might have been advised to me from the office, and, if so, of which I had no recollection. With this fact known to him, Mr. Fleming, after seven weeks' consideration of my letter, deliberately charges his superior officer with delay and neglect in not having held the examinations in August or September. August 13th he visited the Talbotstown Female National School, and in his report thereon, recommended that "It would be desirable to let her (Mary Murray) remain as temporary teacher, but not recognised" (I quote from page 11 of letter), "or sanctioned by the Board (and consequently without salary) until the examination of female teachers took place." This recommendation was not approved for some time, so that under any circumstances Mary Murray could not, as Mr. Fleming well knew, when writing his letter now quoted from, be summoned in the capacity of teacher, before the month of September. This disposes of the month of August, apart altogether from the facts already set forth regarding Mr. Fleming's certain knowledge that the examination of the men, and the mistresses are examined at the same period, could not be held until I should receive from him the dockets, &c., which awaited correct filling in Greystones. Yet further evidence of Mr. Fleming's want of accuracy remains to be exhibited, and, as before, it shall be done through his own written testimony. I wrote to Mr. Fleming in August, from Greystones, informing him of my intentions as to the inspection of his schools, &c., and requesting that he would join me there as early as possible. His answer to this request, dated "Kiltegan, Baltinglass, August 9th, 1856," is now before me, wherein he states:—"Having recently got a reminder from the office, I am busy furnishing the business of the 2d Term of Inspection. As yet there remain some 21 schools to be visited and reported on. I trust to be able to get through them all before the month terminates, as they are, with some few exceptions, no single schools in this part of the district. I shall, however, get on as rapidly as possible, consistent with a vigilant inspection of the schools referred to, after which I shall be at your service at any time you require." Mr. Fleming remained in that locality until the end of August, and on the evening of September 5th I first met him in Greystones. You now see, gentlemen, that on the inspection of Talbotstown Female National School, August 13th, four days after the date of the above letter, Mr. Fleming could not have expected the district examination of teachers to be held by him and me in August, as he states it might have been; and in charging me with neglect of duty in not so holding the examination, it remains for the Commissioners to decide whether, from the evidence before them, he was not fully aware that the charge was utterly false.

I wrote to Mr. Fleming respecting the very improper manner in which he had made up the written papers of the male teachers and his apology of July 4th has been quoted. Instead of early in April, I do not get the exercises until July; no return accompanied them of the teachers who attended, of those that absented themselves, or the heads under which the parties were summoned. The prescribed form of summary report on the state of their schools was not sent, nor

* In telling me of the case fortunately there was a third party present, and it was he who brought to my recollection who Reverend Mr. Nowlan was, as I denied to Mr. Fleming any personal knowledge of him; this was my first knowledge of the case at the close of September.

nor was the back of the dockets filled in reference to inspectors' opinion of the schools, so that I knew nothing whatever of his opinion of their worth as teachers. The usual list, giving inspector's opinion as to whether, on the whole, each teacher's examination and general worth were such as to entitle him to be re-called to the oral examination, was not sent. The backs of the dockets of 15 masters were a perfect blank, although suggested by similar neglect on the part of some of the officers, a special circular, with annexed example, was sent to all the inspectors in 1855, prescribing the form for filling these documents. Mr. Fleming disregarded this circular in reference to the examination of 1855, and repeated it in 1856, when I was compelled to inform him that if the business of ten district inspectors was thrown on me in reference to this part of the duties of the examination, I would be obliged to give up much of my ordinary employment; and on this account, I was sorry to be obliged to return the papers that he might fill them properly as instructed by Board's circular. The exercises of the men, instead of being fastened together by a stitch, or a pin, so as to have each man's papers together, reached me as a roll of some 400 detached leaves, coiled up and tied. I bore with the irregularity of 1855, but I deemed it time to require Mr. Fleming to show something like respect for the instructions of the Commissioners in reference to the examinations, especially enjoying, as he does, the rank and emoluments of a first class inspector. Some of the answers in the written papers were not marked; some of the papers were not forthcoming; none of the results of the examination, or the details of the answering, were transferred to the back of the dockets; and it was only September 5th, Mr. Fleming arrived at Greystones to "put," as promised in his letter of the 13th August, "all to rights." I sent the papers to him, with one of the men's dockets correctly filled by myself, as an example of the instructions in the Board's circular of 1855; he returned them some time after (his journal for the month will likely show what days he was engaged upon them), and it was only on October 2d, the day before I left the district, that I was able to finally read over the papers and returns with him, with a view to rejecting undeserving candidates. I had, however, read over the papers myself at an earlier date, but I was ignorant as to the state of nearly all the men's schools, or as to the results of the inspection of them since the holding of the written examination six months back.

I may add that I have never before officially, or semi-officially, reported, or mentioned, except to himself, this serious irregularity and neglect on Mr. Fleming's part, in reference to the written examination of the male teachers, although a circular * approved of by the office, and drawn up by me last Easter, was specially framed and intended to correct such laxity, should it exist in any other officer's conduct, and certainly I have never met another instance of the kind, although I have been connected in the examinations with 40 inspectors. Nor is this report of it voluntary and gratuitous; it is wrung from me as an essential portion of evidence, that Mr. Fleming's character and conduct in this whole matter may be clearly seen by the Commissioners.

* See Circular, and also that of 1855 with annexed example.

I have shown that I had intended to hold the examinations in August or September, but that I was prevented by Mr. Fleming's irregularity in reference to the necessary papers and returns, by his absence on other duty in a remote part of the district, and, finally, when the close of September came, Mr. Fleming expressed a wish to have the teachers examined with those of District 28 in Dublin during the Christmas holidays. The case of Mary Murray had nothing whatsoever to do with the holding of examination then, although strange to say, Mr. Fleming makes the singular admission that, "had those examinations been held in August or September, Mary Murray would receive her salary in due course, and the matter would have been arranged to the satisfaction of all parties." If this be Mr. Fleming's opinion, as it certainly is mine, from the examination of the young woman in January last, how can he reconcile it with his deliberate recommendation, for which he compliments himself (page 11) on the exercise of "a wise discretion;" that "Mary Murray should remain as temporary teacher, but not recognised or sanctioned by the Board (and consequently without salary), until the examination of female teachers took place." He recommends, subsequent to August 13th (date of visit to the school), that she should be permitted to hold the place, and perform the duties of a teacher, but without the name or salary of such, yet he believes that had the young woman been examined in August, the same month, by him and me, she would receive

Page 31 of Mr. Fleming's letter.

receive her salary, extending back through the months of June and July; and the matter would have been arranged to the satisfaction of all parties. I have already stated that I first heard of the case, or had my attention called to it by Mr. Fleming, the last week in September.

Up to this I have avoided calling attention to the unwarrantable line of conduct pursued by Mr. Fleming, in attempting to prescribe to me when and how I am to perform my duties. I feel with the office, and with my colleagues, that it is very desirable that examinations, &c. for each year should be held within the year,* and this has been done by me each year since 1848, with the exception of 1855 and 1856, owing to causes known to you; and there may be one, but scarcely more, of my colleagues who has not been obliged to hold examinations in January for the previous year. Further it is to be recollected that in 1855 and last year, five head inspectors did the duty of six, by which I had two districts beyond my due in charge. The same presumption is marked in his complaint of the place where the examination was held, as apart altogether from the fact that Mr. Fleming wished the examination to be held in Dublin, he was perfectly well aware that there is an order of the Board permitting such; and he was aware that his late head inspector, Dr. Newell, in Cork, and Mr. M'Creedy, in Dublin, and others of my colleagues elsewhere, had so called the teachers and inspectors of two or more districts together, whilst I am, I believe, the person who has least availed himself of the privilege.

If this were an ordinary case, I would feel it my duty to refer Mr. Fleming's letters of 52 pages back to the office, respectfully requesting that as there is no denial, or attempt at denial, of the main charge against him, that of procuring the removal of a teacher upon, amongst other grounds, want of literary attainments which he did not test, and her subsequent temporary restoration without examination, I was not to change places with the party who had so acted, and permit him to turn round and bring a series of charges, in no way connected with the simple case in question, against me. According to all official order and propriety these should be made the subject of a separate and distinct communication, and should be dealt with apart from a case with which most of them have no connexion. In this instance, however, I hope that good will arise from waiving from, and dealing with the whole question on its moral merits.

1. *Mary Murray's Age* (page 6).—Mr. Fleming returned it as 19 years, in a report, November 1855, and as 17½ in a subsequent report, March 1856, stating, however, in the latter, that her looks and general appearance indicated only 15½ years. She must have looked at least as young in the previous November. Strange that Mr. Fleming should then not have alluded to the seeming contradiction between her age as returned, and as indicated by her looks, although he does so in a subsequent report when she returned herself, as is said, at only 17½ years. Or, if she had returned herself as 18 months younger after a lapse of four months, strange that he should not have called attention to the inconsistency of the matter in the report upon which she was removed. If she returned herself as 19, it is singular that only four months after she should forget this altogether, and return herself as precisely 17½ years. Neither Mr. Coyle nor I have any doubt that when she came before us for three days in January last, she looked her returned age, 18¼ years. There are many first class teachers not older, and several have got charge of district model schools at, or under, 19 years of age.

2. *The Inexperience of Mary Murray, and her want of Method.*—As before remarked, inexperience, in this sense, would prevent us from appointing, for the first time, not only all teachers, but all inspectors; it was her first school, she had been educated in it, and so apt must she have been in improving her method, &c., that, whilst her age, one of the grounds of objection, was improved by not quite five months, and whilst the inspector continued as ignorant and as incurious as to her scholarship as before, he actually found such a change

* Mr. Fleming goes much farther; he requires his head inspector to hold the examinations not merely within the year, but in whatever month or months of it he is pleased to dictate. If the 10 district inspectors all agreed with him as to holding them "in the fine warm weather," it would be difficult for the head inspector to satisfy all in relation to the thermometer.

change for the better in her method, from March to August, as to warrant him, on this ground chiefly, if not alone, to alter his opinion, and recommend her for further trial.

3. *Mary Murray's Examination and Classification.*—She was examined with seven other female teachers from Mr. Fleming's, and 14 from Mr. Coyle's district, by these gentlemen and me. Her written exercises were marked by Mr. Coyle, but revised and slightly lowered in merit by me in the presence of both inspectors; and her oral examination, as a member of a class of 22, was thus divided: Mr. Coyle marked reading and grammar; Mr. Fleming, geography and lesson books, and the spelling book superseded; and arithmetic fell to my share. Not the slightest difference of opinion arose in reference to the propriety of classing her second division of third, and to get salary as a probationer from the previous June up to January; and the marks which in the aggregate she had obtained were compared with those of others on first division of the class; no proposal was made by me to place her thereon, but as a mere indication of her relative claims.

4. *The detection of a Geography with Mary Murray at the Examination.*—Mr. Fleming has various peculiarities, even in the sense which he attaches to common words: thus, he says, I made a speech to the teachers, directing them not to use books or any unfair means of obtaining answers to the questions, just as when he states that I accuse him of guessing the teacher's age when I say he estimated it; this being very different from guessing. I had occasion to be absent from the examination room for some time, and on my return I was told by Mr. Fleming that he had found a geography generalised open in Mary Murray's lap. I at once inquired into the matter, and found that it had been brought by Miss Doyle, of Phibsboro', who volunteered the admission that she had never used it; that it was placed by her side on the form, and had fallen to the next step below, where Mary Murray sat, and that she, Mary Murray, had taken it up, and that Mr. Fleming had found it in her lap. I was displeased with Miss Doyle, as I could not see why she brought the book except to use it; but on the other hand, there was no evidence whatever that she had done so, and when the book dropped by Mary Murray, I do not wonder at her taking it up; I had no evidence to satisfy me that she had used it, and her paper on the subject shows that she had not, to keep her in the examination. I may also mention that during my absence, either the Resident Commissioner or Mr. M'Cuddy sent for Mr. Fleming in reference to what Mr. Fleming described to me as an anonymous letter, in the handwriting of Rev. Mr. Nowlan, manager of Mary Murray's school, in which the worst sentiments were expressed in relation to Mr. Fleming; and it was soon after his return from this interview that he detected the book. I gave the matter the fullest consideration that evening with Mr. Coyle, and I saw nothing in it to warrant further notice.

5. *Rev. Mr. Nowlan's Letter or Note of January* 26, 1857.—Mr. Fleming was irritated beyond description on reading this note, addressed to the Secretaries, which he described as anonymous, but in Mr. Nowlan's handwriting; and on expressing my doubt that he would be capable of such conduct, Mr. Fleming, during the mid-day recess, on the 29th January, pressed me to go with him to the office that he might show me the letter, and Mr. Coyle accompanied us. On the letter being placed in my hands, I was surprised to find the so-called anonymous letter with the name of the writer to it. He began it, if I recollect rightly, in the third and ended in the first person, on another page; and on reading it, I asked Mr. Fleming if he had any objection that Mr. Coyle should see the letter, and on his replying in the negative, I handed it to him to read. This is the instance of "bad taste" on my part which Mr. Fleming refers to, that I should show, with his full permission, this offensive note to Mr. Coyle, a man selected within that month as Mr. Fleming's nearest and best friend, although the young lads in the offices might all peruse it.

6. *Short Notice of Examination, &c., January* 19.—I met Mr. Fleming in the office, and apprised him that the examinations would be held on the 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th of same month, and his letter, dated Greystones, January 21, stating that he had then summoned all of his teachers, is now before me. There was but one teacher absent, and he, a probationer, cannot have failed to attend

attend owing to short notice; so that Mr. Fleming's complaint of his never having had more than a few days' notice of the time for holding them is disposed of; he had eight to eleven days, which was ample, as the result proved.

It is also stated that (p. 17), "In consequence of this unnecessary delay" (in holding the examination) "Rev. Mr. Nowlan seems to have lost all patience, and with some reason, as the promised decision of the head inspector was to all appearance indefinitely postponed." I never promised any decision, nor did I ever receive, that I recollect, any special instructions about the case, which I first heard of September 22d or 23d; and that Rev. Mr. Nowlan's frame of mind is not correctly described, in relation to the alleged delay, I beg to inform you that in the only note,* dated January 5, 1857, which I ever had from Rev. Mr. Nowlan, there is an appeal to me to have his master in Rathvilly National School recalled to the oral examination, which I refused, and it contains not the slightest allusion to the Talbotstown case.

7. *Examination of Mary Murray as a Pupil in the School; how far a Plea for not examining her when a Teacher.*—As stated in my letter of January 31, when Mr. Fleming paid his first visit, or made his only inspection in Talbotstown Female School, he spent 2¼ hours in it, and examined Mary Murray as one of 11 pupils in her class, and of 50 present in the school; and it was impossible that he could have foreseen the circumstances which led to the removal of the teacher by which Mary Murray came to succeed her. Even if he had a very distinct recollection of her answering as a scholar in fourth class in August, the following November, the subsequent March, or the next August, her literary proficiency might have been as improved as her great defect, method, turned out to have been in five months according to Mr. Fleming's own report. Mr. Fleming adduces the cases of two schools† in which I spent as short a time, and he might adduce, if he examined my reports, hundreds; but in these two cases he examined with me, which is equal to doubling the time; and so far as I am concerned, I have not, although gifted with extremely good memory, the faintest recollection of any individual pupil examined in them, and still less could I remember the details of any pupil's answering so as to serve instead of the required examination of a probationary teacher, as pointed out in the code. He admits (p. 29), that from memory alone, and without reference to his note book, or some written document connected with the case, he could tell nothing about the observations left by him in any school in his charge; and if his memory be so bad in reference to what he writes in relation to the proficiency of whole classes and general opinions as to the merit and condition of schools, the impression which Mary Murray's answering in class made upon him, must be an extraordinary instance of vividness and permanence, when it is so remarkably exceptional in character.

8. *Wicklow*

---

* I attach this note to last page, and from its tone there can be no doubt that if Rev Mr. Nowlan felt any impatience, or disappointment, regarding the alleged delay in holding the examination, he would have expressed such to me; he does not even refer to the case, nor has he ever written to me on the subject. He wrote 1st January 1857 to Mr. Fleming on official business, and makes no reference to the case; and finally, in his very offensive note (26/1/57) against Mr. Fleming, acknowledging receipt of teachers' summons to the examination, he never complains to the Secretaries of the delay.

† Arklow, Female—147 present.

1st. Book	102	
2d. „	24	45
Seq. „	10	
3d. „	6	
4th. „	5	

Time, 2¼ hours; Mr. Fleming and me.

Ballinacarring, Mixed—82 present.

1st. Book	31	
2d. „	27	51
Seq. „	9	
3d. „	10	
4th. „	5	

Time, 2.20; by Mr. Fleming and me.

Talbotstown, Female—over 50 present.

1st. Book	21	
4th. „	11	29
Rest	18	

Time, 2.15; by Mr. Fleming.

Note.—In the case of Arklow School, of the 102 in 1st. Book, 46 were in alphabet and 18 in alphabet sections, or 64 in letters.

8. *Wicklow Case; how far a Plea for Mr. Fleming's Conduct.*—The case of Anne Salmon, of Wicklow, had not one single feature similar to, or in common with that of Mary Murray, of Talbotstown. I first set my foot in Wicklow, and Wicklow National Schools on the evening of February 21st, 1856, and on the next two days, the examination of the teachers was held. On one of these days, Mr. Fleming brought under my notice these schools; the large population; the number on rolls, about 200 in each school; and the low character of both in public estimation, owing wholly to the inefficiency of the staff of teachers. The head master, Naughten, was then under sentence of removal, although classed second, or it may be that Mr. Fleming told me that he expected he would be removed, which he was, for continuous inefficiency. The assistant, Jones, was rather unsuitable; and in the girls' school, Anne Salmon, appointed 3/53, and classed third (not a probationer, as Mr. Fleming (page 9) incorrectly states), was chief teacher, and Emma Farrell, a probationer assistant to her. I read Mr. Fleming's reports in the observation books of both schools, and they were extremely unfavourable; in fact, they could scarcely be more so. Mr. Fleming most earnestly urged me to see Rev. Mr. Grant, the manager, and to suggest to him to make a clearing out of this whole staff, and provide efficient teachers who would raise the character of the schools in public estimation, and I acted on his suggestion, as the evidence before me was ample to satisfy me that at least the heads of the schools were unsuited for such important posts as they filled. That was merely my advice to the manager, and in it he and at least one of his curates concurred; but what is there in all that bearing the remotest analogy to the case of Mary Murray? Nothing whatever. The one was in charge of a remote rural school in a mountainous locality, with an average attendance of about 30 pupils; the other the head of a school, with an average of 70, but which, under an efficient teacher, might from the population be 200 or upwards; the one was the chief town of the county, and with inhabitants whose educational wants were higher and more numerous; the other was a remote district, affording but poor remuneration to a teacher.

Did I, when I had opportunity, forego the examination of the parties referred to, as Mr. Fleming had done in the other case? Not at all. Although Rev. Mr. Grant assented to the expediency of their removal, I followed up the routine of my duties, examined Anne Salmon and Emma Farrell on the two days that I was there, and recommended the removal of the latter for total literary incompetency, and classed Anne Salmon third, as she was, but mentioned on the classification sheets the probability that manager would remove her as unsuitable for such a school.

Again, on visiting the schools in the following August, I examined the male assistant, Jones; I had the pleasure of procuring a superior head master instead of Naughten; and I examined the assistant, Eliza Reynolds, and although returning herself as only 15½ years, I recommended her recognition under her sister, the head mistress, who succeeded Anne Salmon, and who ranked second division of first class. In all this, where is there a single warranty to indicate that I could approve of the course pursued by Mr. Fleming in relation to not examining Mary Murray?

9. *The Complaint of Mr. Fleming as to my Absence at the Levee on the 28th January, and the Consequences of same.*—The teachers to be examined consisted of 14 men and 22 women; 12 of the 36 were from Mr. Fleming's district, 21 from Mr. Coyle's, and 3 from districts 19, 22, and 24. To examine these 36, 12 of whom were probationers, 11 of third class, 11 in second, and 2 in the lowest division of first class, there were two first class inspectors and myself, and four days were assigned to the duty. On one of the days of the examination, January 28th, knowing that I should be absent for about an hour beyond the usual hour's recess at mid-day, I gave notice both to inspectors and teachers on the previous day that I would attend earlier in the morning, and I requested the teachers then present to be earlier in attendance. I left the examination room close upon 12 o'clock, Mr. Coyle being then in the room as well as Mr. Fleming, and I returned before three o'clock, and remained examining until six o'clock. Before I left I had arranged the female teachers for their written examination, taken their names, schools, ranks, &c. and given out their first paper, leaving directions as to the time of giving out the other three papers. It is untrue that Mr. Fleming or Mr. Coyle had any undue, or even their proper, share

share of the duty imposed upon them; and it is especially untrue that Mr. Fleming was left single-handed, as he states, to do anything or direct anything connected with the general proceedings of the examination. The production of the official record of the oral answering of both men and women, will prove that no statements could be more opposed to truth than those made by Mr. Fleming in reference to the manner in which the examinations were conducted. There was neither haste nor hurry, and the following abstract from the joint record by Messrs. Coyle and Fleming, and me, will show the ample justice done to the teachers, and the precise share which Mr. Fleming took in the subjects of examination. The subjects of the oral examination were thus distributed:

* 1. Reading—14 men examined on by me; Messrs. Coyle and Fleming present.
2. Grammar—6 by me; 6 by Mr. Coyle; and 2, Mr. Fleming.
* Parsing—6 by me; rest did not parse.
3. Geography, Maps—14, Mr. Fleming.
Mathematical, &c.—6 by me.
4. Spelling and Derivation—12, Mr. Coyle; 2, Mr. Fleming.
5. Lesson Books—14, Messrs. Coyle and Fleming.
6. Money Matters—5 by me; and 9, Mr. Fleming.

7. Reasoning	8	All examined by me.
8. Arithmetic	14	
9. Mensuration	14	
10. Geometry	8	
11. Algebra	8	
12. Natural Philosophy	8	
13. Book-keeping	14	

Apart from the subjects (*) the proficiency in which we denote by letters rather than by numbers, of 1,011 distinct questions put, and the answers to which are recorded, 576, or more than half of them, were put by me, the other half being divided between Messrs. Coyle and Fleming; and whilst Mr. Fleming asked from 20 to 30 questions on outline maps of each teacher, my questions were chiefly on subjects of a widely different character; thus at least six to each on geometry, four on algebra, to some men 16 on natural philosophy, to each four on mensuration and eight on arithmetic. On whom then did the weight of the examination fall? On me alone.* Previous to the examination, I understood Mr. Fleming to say he would take the mathematical subjects, but when the time came he evinced a disinclination to undertake them, so they fell to me.

Mr. Fleming had only four male teachers from his district, one 3^2, one 2^2, one 2^1 and 1^3. Apart from reading, parsing, &c. these men were asked 292 oral questions, or 73 to each, and let him refer me to any more extensive or more searching examination of the kind, in which he ever before shared.

Perhaps it might be thought if I failed to refer to the written portion of the examination of both sexes, that it was in this branch that the undue labour fell upon Mr. Fleming. How he sent me the men's papers I have already stated, and of the written exercises of the eight mistresses who attended he marked those of two teachers, Mr. Coyle those of three,† and I those of the remaining three.

In addition to the immediate duty of the examination, I computed the travelling allowance of the 36 teachers, made more tedious, they being from five

* At the oral examination of both sexes there were 1,755 questions put thus, by—

Mr. Coyle	338
Mr. Fleming	409
Both, or either	72
Mr. Kavanagh	936
Total	1755

Mr. Coyle also examined women on reading and parsing, and I examined men on reading and parsing.

† Mr. Coyle marked the written exercises of the entire 14 female teachers of his own district, and more than Mr. Fleming of those that of the Wicklow district. Mr. Coyle marked the papers of 17 teachers, Mr. Fleming of 2.

five different districts, wrote out the lists and paid the expenses; I also, as is my habit, wrote out the classification sheets for the office, and his signature was almost the burden of the clerical duty which devolved upon Mr. Fleming.

Instead of either hurry or haste in connexion with the examination, so far as the teachers were concerned, on the last day, Friday, the proceedings closed about two o'clock, or earlier, and about four we adjourned to the waiting room in the office, where, with Mr. Coyle's help, we were enabled to mark the written exercises of the eight mistresses, and classify these and the four men from Mr. Fleming's district by half-past seven o'clock. Doubtless Mr. Fleming would have much preferred going home, as I would also, and attend next day, and receive, as he would, 7 *s.* 6 *d.* allowance therefor; but I deemed it better to classify the teachers while our impressions of them were fresh, and thus close the business of his district. The one evening's inconvenience to him is a matter of frequent occurrence with me through the round of my circuit.

I trust that the nature of the complaints respecting the discharge of my duty in relation to the examination of the teachers held in Dublin, and remembering from whom they come, against whom directed, and the occasion which calls them forth, will excuse the detailed reply which I have felt it proper to make to them.

10. It is also stated, as a matter of grave moment, that the male and female teachers were brought together for the purpose of examination, and such statement can have no pertinency to the case of Mary Murray, or why Mr. Fleming did not examine her, unless he means to urge it as a reason that she would have made still better written answering had the mistresses only been present. On the occasion in question the women were engaged writing their exercises on the desks in Mr. Sheehy's lecture-room, and the men sat in a semicircle below, on the platform, their backs turned to the women, and not only separated from each other by a rail, but they entered and left the room by different doors. The sexes were not examined together orally, or in any sense whatever, beyond the physical fact that they occupied the same room, intercourse of any kind between them being totally impossible; as to "the clatter of tongues," such certainly would disturb the parties writing if it existed. I have yet, however, to meet an instance of it at a teachers' examination. We had men alone on Tuesday, men and women on Wednesday, women and a few men on Thursday, and women on Friday; on some of the days we occupied the museum, and we divided the room between the classes, an inspector going to either end of the museum with his own class. Mr. Fleming entirely ignores the fact that the centres of the 50 districts are all, or nearly all, the largest towns in the country; that it is there that all the teachers are again and again examined; that both sexes if not examined on the same day, are examined one to-day, the other on the subsequent day; that being in the town at the same time is usual; and, as was the case in this instance, generally half of the teachers are trained, and are therefore accustomed to protect themselves when from home. I entertain a very different opinion of the teachers from that indicated by Mr. Fleming's apprehensions, and while I yield to none in the desire to avoid all assemblages which might indirectly lead to even the semblance of improper familiarity between the sexes, I cannot assent to the flimsy squeamishness which would permit a young woman to come to Dublin to be trained, and away from her family, to protect herself by her own instinctive discretion on Sundays, Saturdays, &c., when under no control, and yet could not witness her in a large public room engaged in her duties, under the direction of three married men, without the most prurient associations being awakened, because some dozen other men are sitting with their backs turned to her, in a remote part of the room.

11. "The head inspector should not, by the systematic neglect of an important duty, dishearten and annoy those whom he is bound to cheer and support" (writes Mr. Fleming, page 16), and again (page 34), "I feel sincere pleasure in being able to state that I have always been fortunate enough to to earn the esteem and good opinion of the* several head inspectors under whose superintendence

* I know this statement to be not a fact in the case of at least two, and I am not one of the two. *J. W. K.*

intendence I have been placed. Mr. Kavanagh is the only and exceptional case to the contrary during an official career of nearly 11 years as district inspector."

The systematic neglect is explained as referring to the delay in holding the examinations, a question already dealt with, and which Mr. Fleming states is the cause of Rev. Mr. Nowlan's offensive and disrespectful letter to the Secretaries about him; the rest of these two extracts evidently implies that, previous to the complaint as to Mary Murray's case, Mr. Fleming's relations with me were, to say the least, unfriendly. So far from this being the case, that to put Mr. Fleming and his statements in the clearest light before the Commissioners, I am reluctantly compelled, as in the many other instances in this letter, to mention facts and circumstances in disproof which otherwise should never be brought before the Commissioners. Mr. Fleming and I were first brought into immediate official connexion when he got charge of the Wicklow district in 1855, and that connexion ceased in March last. I visited most of the schools in the Drogheda district previously inspected by Mr. Fleming, and although there were many minor faults and errors of judgment in his manner of discharging his duties, yet on the whole I thought favourably of him as an average officer, and in his own presence, and unsolicited by any one, I mentioned to Mr. Kelly the several good points in his proceedings. In 1854 he drew up his outline map, and so anxious was he to obtain my support for it, with a view to recommending its adoption by the Board, that he went down specially to Drogheda, Cork being then his residence, to see me upon the subject. I examined the maps and the text most carefully, pointed out many defects, and, anxious to serve him, lent my support to it only on his promising to have these remedied in a second edition. One of the maps faulted by me he has since removed, and replaced it by a somewhat better, and so anxious was I to serve him, and at the same time not commit either my character or my conscience, that on going down to Greystones last autumn, I brought with me a copy of the atlas, with the maps and text carefully revised by me. This copy I submitted to him. We went over the errors, which he thanked me for correcting, and I placed at his disposal expensive and most modern atlasses and geographies to aid him in bringing out, as he promised, an improved edition of his little work. During the month (September) that we were in Greystones he visited schools with me, he coming on my car whenever available; and not merely was our official relations, but our social and private intercourse was of the most friendly character. I left Greystones October 3d, but returned there the 29th, at the request of Mr. Fleming, whose guest I was for the three days that I remained inspecting schools, &c., with him. It is remarkable, in reference to the question of the date of holding the examinations, that during my stay there no reference was made to the case of Mary Murray. The same feeling continued between Mr. Fleming and me up to the last moment of our intercourse. The very last day we met was the 30th January, when the examinations closed; that day we lunched together, and that night, when we last parted, I drove him, after we had classed the teachers in the office, in my car, with Mr. Coyle, to the nearest point to his lodgings, in Portobello, and we parted on the usual kindly terms. With Mr. Fleming I have never had any disagreement or misunderstanding such as the terms of his letter would indicate. January 31st, the very next day, after the close of the examination, impressed with the deep injustice and the highly irregular and improper proceeding in the case of Mary Murray, I wrote the complaint of that date, and to shrink from my obvious duty in so doing would, in my conscience, incriminate me, as well in that case as in any similar one which might hereafter occur, from my neglect or partiality in omitting to do so. Mr. Fleming, amongst his other strange contradictions and inconsistencies, persists (page 30) in stating that Mary Murray was not "deprived of her bread" in consequence of his neglect. He says, "this is merely figurative speech; dealing with facts it has no meaning; she was not deprived of her bread, nor even of the price of a single loaf through his (Mr. F.'s) means." What is his explanation of this singular statement? That "he (Mr. Kavanagh) and I (himself) had already signed the classification sheet, recommending restoration of salary to Mary Murray, as probationer, from the date of its withdrawal, and from January 1857 as third class teacher."

These statements, in the face of the plain facts of the case, are, from their nature, exempt from comment.

The last point in the whole case is that, in reference to the absence of entry in the inspector's observation book at his visit in August, to explain the grounds upon which he founded his change of opinion as to the retention on trial till the examination of Mary Murray in the school. I did not make this statement without what appeared to me reliable evidence; Mr. Fleming does not deny the accuracy of the statement, and I have sent to the manager of the school for the observation book, which I shall send to the office.

I mentioned incidentally at the close of my letter of January 31st as follows: "I may here add that I had, in autumn last, to call Mr. Fleming's attention to some serious instances somewhat similar to this (Talbotstown Female National School), in which he expressed himself in the strongest and most decided terms in the observation books as to the unfitness of teachers; and in his next or subsequent reports in the book, the same parties being in charge of the schools, no explanation whatever is put forward to account for the change of opinion. The cases of the worst kind are Carrigower (12/6/55) and Barniskey (18/12/25.)." Mr. Fleming received this letter March 2d, and was unable to reply to this particular paragraph (and the details which follow it) until the end of May, a period of three months. He admits that he had to wait to inspect the observation books of all the schools in the district which were visited by me before he was in a position to reply to it. This affords a very unsatisfactory view of the manner in which a first class inspector keeps his note books, as there should be nothing in the observation books, a record of which should not be made in his own note books, especially on so vital a point as the competency or incompetency, or the unsuitability of any of the staff of the school.

Like Mary Murray's case, he admits the absence of any entry on subsequent visits which would explain his altered opinion, if altered, in reference to the fitness and worth of the teachers in Carrigower and Barniskey, as reported at the dates quoted. He admits the accuracy of the quotations of the strongly expressed opinions as taken from the observation books. He admits that I called his attention to this inconsistency in both these cases (letter 29/5/57, page 2), in September last, yet in pages 10, 11, and 12 of same letter he attempted to state that it was only in January I first took that view of this irregular and inconsistent proceeding on his part. He further asks why I deferred noticing officially such instances of omission, if they really existed, until the 31st January; he admits I noticed them officially to himself, and must mean why I did not report them as a formal complaint. I read over my notes of inspection of all, or nearly all, his schools, as visited by me, to Mr. Fleming officially; and pointed out to him such leading defects as required correction. Thus the use of unnecessarily strong language in the observation books, and occasionally in the district books; his discontinuance of steel pens; the roughness of his manner to the children (specially complained of in Bray Convent National School);* frequent omission of any entry of some visits in observation books; requiring the children to "count the stops" when reading; ampler notes to be taken of the examination of the classes; omissions of important matters (as general lesson) to be entered in observation book; scantiness of entries at foot of old form of observation book, &c., &c.; and inconsistent reports, as in the cases of Carrigower and Barniskey. Mr. Fleming might as well now interrogate me as to why these and many other matters were not entered in my reports upon the schools to which they refer in the line opposite the question, "Are district inspector's suggestions pertinent, &c.?" The school reports, as such, are unsuited for these matters; and in some of my communications in reference to Mr. Fleming's district, I promised that I would forward, which I intend to do, a general report on the inspection of the schools by Mr. Fleming.

The reasons assigned by Mr. Fleming for the omission of any entry in the observation book in Carrigower National Schools at any of the three visits following that of June 12, 1855, which might explain his first entry that the teacher "cannot

* This he should specially avoid, as soon after his appointment as inspector Mr. M'Creedy had to correct him for striking children in the school upon the head in Mr. M'Creedy's presence, during the examination of the classes. *J. W. K.*

"cannot be sanctioned as qualified to conduct a school," do not appear to me at all satisfactory. Mr. Fleming arrived at that opinion without any reference to a head inspector, or to any district examination; and it was his bounden duty (as in the case of Mary Murray) to examine Davis next visit, November 6, 1855, and record the result in the observation book, especially with such a strong and decided opinion already entered against the man, or he should have examined him next visit, January 18, 1856, and recorded the result; a third visit was made, June 18, 1856, and still either no examination, or at least no record of it. When I visited, August 8, I at once examined the man, and if the district inspectors be permitted to evade this most important part of their duty on such unfounded pretexts as "the case is pending, awaiting the district examination," the results would be ruinous to the prospects of our schools. This single case affords an apt illustration, as Davis absented himself from the oral examination, held in January last; case still pending therefore.

In the Barniskey case, Mr. Fleming's reason for the omission in his report of June 1856, of any explanation of why the teacher continued in the school after such an extremely bad report at previous visit, is the most singular and simple exercise of benevolence that has ever come to my knowledge. July 18, 1855, Mr. Fleming reported in the observation book, "Neatness and cleanliness worse, if possible, than at last inspection; accounts carelessly and negligently kept; suggestions left wholly neglected. I believe he is a most indolent and inefficient person, and I earnestly recommend rev. manager to remove him from a situation for which he is wholly unqualified." He tells of his interview with manager, and of the grounds upon which he changed his mind; also of what he inserted in his report to the office upon his inspection of June 1856; but he should have inserted these grounds in the observation book also, to explain to a new inspector, or new manager, his own conduct in the matter. He says, "As some efforts" (since the December visit) "had been made to remove existing defects, I was unwilling to damp future exertions on the part of the teacher, by making any very unfavourable entries in the observation book." In other words, the man and the school had improved a little, at least something, and out of prudence and kindness the inspector would not damp his exertions by entering it, especially necessary as it was after last bad report. This explanation I also regard as quite unsatisfactory.

Mr. Fleming challenges me to name a single instance (page 2, letter 29/5/57) of any other case of this kind upon which I spoke to him, besides the two cited; and from mere memory, unaided by reference to my notes, I am able to do so—St. Kevin's National Schools. This paraded request to name another single instance is the less defensible, seeing that Mr. Fleming states he made an inspection for the special purpose of all the schools visited by me; and if so he must have been in St. Kevin's, as he well knew that I had visited it. On his visit, February 20, 1856, he entered in the observation book that the paid monitor (Mich. Healy, app. 7/54) was not qualified, and if not improved by next inspection, that he, Mr. Fleming, would remove him. Now in the subsequent visit of July 18, there is not any reference whatever in the report in the observation book to the promised examination, or to the qualifications of the same monitor, who was then in office. I have written to the manager to send the observation books, and I shall forward them to the office. Not only is this so, but bad as Mr. Fleming admits his memory to be, I think he can have no difficulty in recollecting my having mentioned to him, when reading over my notes of these cases, that his omission to make an entry, on his visit of July 18, to explain his threat of February, was the more singular, seeing that he examined, as I learned, the monitor at his summer visit to the school.

I have now noticed every point requiring notice in Mr. Fleming's two letters, of 52 pages, in reply to my complaint preferred against him January 31st last. The complaint was a serious but simple one, that a newly-appointed teacher, whose school was twice examined by Mr. Fleming, was removed upon, amongst other grounds, want of literary qualification, but that since her appointment inspector had never examined her; and, having her removed, or salary withdrawn from her, without examination, he had her retained on trial, on a subsequent report, without any examination either. Whilst fully admitting these facts, Mr. Fleming turns round, and, departing from the simple case before him, he takes leave not only to criticise my conduct, but even the very orders

of the Board under which I have been acting. The question involved is a far more important one than that of Mary Murray. I am senior amongst my colleagues; I have served as many years as head inspector as Mr. Fleming has as district inspector, and not only I do not claim, but I repudiate all pretension to have the slightest claim, on personal or on official grounds, to have any weight attached to my testimony in a matter of this kind, beyond its intrinsic worth. If the humblest monitor or pupil feels aggrieved, his full right to complain, in proper form, should be recognised. In the discharge of a solemn and painful duty I preferred my complaint against Mr. Fleming, in my letter of January 31st, and in doing so I confined myself strictly, with the exception of the reference to a kindred irregularity in last paragraph, to the recital of the facts of the case. In replying to Mr. Fleming's letters of 52 pages, which engaged his attention three months from the receipt of my complaint, I have been obliged to enter into details which were unavoidable.

I request the decision of the Commissioners on two distinct points, viz.: Mr. Fleming's conduct in not examining Mary Murray; and, 2dly, the truth of the allegations which he puts forth in his letters, the serious matters here stated in my reply, and his general conduct in the whole business.

I am, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh,*
Head Inspector.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

(A.)

Copy of Letter from Rev. Mr. *Nolan,* on Talbotstown Case.

Gentlemen, Rathvilly, 11 June 1856.

It is now nearly a month since I received a note, stating that the salary would be withdrawn after a certain time from the present mistress, Mary Murray, of Talbotstown National School, County Wicklow. The cause stated, that "she is not qualified to conduct the school with efficiency." I must suppose this is stated on the authority of the inspector. I am sorry to be obliged to differ with him; but in justice to myself, the mistress, and the school, I must say that I differ *toto cælo* with Mr. F. on this fact.

The untenable grounds for his judgment, and my reasons for differing with him, shall, if necessary, be stated on another occasion. In the meantime that no evil may arise, I request the Commissioners will be pleased to direct their inspector from the neighbouring district (it is only a few miles from Baltinglass) to visit the school and report; I have no fear of the result. Indeed, I would be sorry she should not answer my hopes, for she is a most respectable young girl, and of as worthy a family as I have in the parish. I hope to be able by degrees to get such a class of teachers into my schools. No man can have a greater desire to have good and efficient schools, and to suppose that I should select unworthy and incompetent persons to conduct them, would argue an amount of folly of which I hope I may plead not guilty. I request this note may be laid before the Commissioners.

I remain, &c.
The Secretaries, Education Office. (signed) *P. C. Nolan.*

(B.)

Dear Sir, Rathvilly, 1 January 1857.

On consulting with my Rev. assistants I have resolved to take into Tineclash School as teachers a man and wife; they are classed, and not lowly. I would not undertake to be always contending with Inspectors and Commissioners—defending an incompetent set. You can then inform the teachers you spoke of to me, that I will not engage them.

I have resolved also to retain the mistress of Rathmore School for the present. Wishing you all the compliments of the season,

I am, &c.
J. G. Fleming, Esq., &c. (signed) *P. C. Nolan.*

(C.)

My dear Sir, Ovoca, 20 March 1857.

You may remember that when here last with me, you called my attention to your inspection of, and report on, the state of the Barniskea National School and teacher, on the 18th December 1855, and requested that I would state to you the impression made on my mind by your comments and report; I will now endeavour briefly to do so; I clearly recollect that I quite concurred in the censure you then passed on the teacher for want of energy in imparting instruction, and for want of cleanliness of schoolroom, and for personal slovenliness; on those matters we entirely agreed, as I thought your reproof just, and sustained it; there was, I think, an argument *ad misericordiam*, urged by the teacher, namely, that his only son, a very interesting boy, died about that time; this, I know, had much weight with us, and besides, amendment was earnestly promised.

I now come to your examination of June 1856, of same school; I was at it with you and remember distinctly that you kindly admitted that improvement and progress had taken place during the interval, but that it should continue and enlarge in order to be satisfactory, I do not think you committed this to the report-book lest it might dull exertion; these are the points that chiefly occur to me at present regarding the inspections alluded to. There is one circumstance I was nigh forgetting; your bringing the teacher to my house and severely reproving him, and most justly so, and I was happy to agree in the reproof. Such are my recollections of the subject matter of this note, and I remember that my impression was then that your zeal was commendable, and not the less so because it was blended with clemency.

I remain, &c.

J. G. Fleming, Esq. (signed) *P. Kearney.*

(1.)

My dear Sir, Greystones, Delgany, 9 August 1856.

I have revised the exercises of the masters who attended the written portion of the examination this year, and the following only are to be recalled to the oral examination:—

	N. Murphy, probationer, Ballyfadd.
	P. Jones, probationer, Wicklow.
	J. Davis, probationer, Carrigower.
If report on his school be very favourable - -	J. Githens, 3^2 class, Rathmeinge.
Scarcely fit - - -	J. Keane, 3^1 class, Rathdrum P. L. U.
	G. Byrne, 2^2 class, Trooperstown.
Hardly fit - - -	J. Lambert, 2^1 class, Arklow.
Rather weak - - -	G. Peyton, 1^3 class, Tinahely.

Of the 13 candidates for promotion, the exercises of eight of them are entirely below what would warrant their being recalled to the oral examination. Unless fully 50 per cent. of the answers are marked satisfactory, or somewhat imperfect, we cannot recall them.

Be so good as to let me know where it is most convenient that the men's exercises should be addressed to you, that the results of the written examination of each teacher be transferred to the back of his docket; as also a summary of the state of his school. I regret having to do this, what I now do for the first time in my life, but I have already stated the grounds upon which I feel constrained to refuse to receive an inspector's work, unless formally and properly done. Stitching the dockets in the order of the men's rank, and stitching each man's papers at the corner (left hand) in the order of the subjects, would keep the work conveniently together. You are of course aware that it is my duty to preserve the dockets, at least, with the results of the examination marked thereon.

Please let me have a list of the female teachers (schools and rank mentioned), whom you intend to summon to this year's examination, that I may fix the time for holding the examination, and while here put it over us. In a week or fortnight you can return me the men's papers and dockets.

This week I found that the new report and register have not reached Callary National School. Did you ever notice that the female teacher in Bray lives in the school room? During school hours you see nothing certainly but cooking utensils; but she, her sister, and family use the room, but only before and after hours as a living room.

I have, &c.
(signed) *J. W. Kavanagh.*

J. G. Fleming, Esq., Rathdrum.

P.S.—When may I expect the district map? I cannot move about without it, and by this time you must know the district fully. I also wrote to the office for a copy of it, but I do not think they have any, except that in the general map of Ireland. Owing to the large increase in the salaries, numbers will like to try their chance of promotion. If a female teacher applies, and that she has the general conditions in her favour, it is unfair to refuse her; but unless you have reason to believe that the party stands some fair chance of promotion, there is no use in upsetting their schools, and annoying them with failure.

(signed) *J. W. K.*

(2.)

My dear Sir, Grenville, Rathgar, 19 January 1857.

In a post or two I shall give you notice to summon your teachers for examination; meantime you will let me know the precise number and rank of the female teachers whom you expect to attend.

I am not yet decided as to whether to summon them with the North Dublin teachers or not; the former was your wish, and would be more convenient, but perhaps such a course now would not so well suit you.

Let me hear from you first post.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh,*
Head Inspector.

J. G. Fleming, Esq.
Inspector of National Schools,
Greystones.

(3.)

Wicklow, 11 August 1858.

I certify that I have a distinct recollection of the following facts, which took place at an examination of myself and other teachers, held in Marlborough-street on 28th and 29th January 1857.

1. Mr. Kavanagh, on entering the room in which the examination took place, spent a considerable time in calling over the names of the teachers, ascertaining their respective classes, and arranging them in their proper order for examination. When he had this part of the business completed, he retired, and did not make his appearance till late on the same evening, when he proceeded to pay all the teachers their travelling expenses. This he did by candle-light. I have not the slightest recollection of his taking any part in the examination, farther than asking a few incidental questions whilst so engaged (for he sat at the same Board with the examiners); but those questions formed no part of the examination, inasmuch as answering them procured no mark. I recollect having answered one of them myself, and one, like the generality of his questions, not found in the programme, for which I got no mark. I distinctly recollect that the greater part of this day's business devolved on Mr. Fleming, for he was examining for some time before Mr. Coyle joined him. I have no recollection whatever of any person assisting him, only I saw

I saw a young man, whom I did not know, furnishing the female teachers with pens, &c. That Mr. Fleming discharged his duty with great vigilance, I think, is evidenced by the following facts: though busily engaged in orally examining the male teachers, I distinctly recollect that he detected a violation of the rules to be observed during examination, which took place amongst the female teachers, and to which he called Mr. Kavanagh's attention when he returned.

2. On the 29th, Mr. Kavanagh did not make his appearance till the examination had continued for some time. He then took the examination of the male teachers into his own hands, and continued it till the close of daylight.

3. Mr. Kavanagh examined on this day, on the following subjects; I am not positive as to their order:—Lessons on reasoning, arithmetic, geometry and mensuration, algebra, book-keeping, natural philosophy.

I am prepared to show that a teacher might thoroughly understand and distinctly remember the whole programme, and yet not answer many of his questions. In arithmetic he did not proceed beyond the compound rules. I am certain that none of the questions he proposed on this subject were taken from any work published by the Board. I suppose they were taken from his own, as he spoke a great deal about it at the examination. His examination on geometry was equally unfair. As I looked through some of "Pott's Geometry," since the examination, I think, had the teachers studied it, they might have answered some of them; but as for knowing what the Board has expressly placed on their own programme, Mr. Kavanagh distinctly told us that he would give no credit to any man for being able to solve problems, classing such as mere child's work. These were nearly his words. I recollect having some conversation with Mr. Peyton, of Tinahely, immediately after the examination. He fully agreed with me in my views of the examination.

(signed) *Joseph Lambert*,
Teacher of Wicklow National School.

(4.)

Sir, Loretto Convent, Bray, 16 August 1858.

I HAVE been greatly surprised and pained to hear that any one could have reported that a complaint had been made of your rude and rough manner towards the children in the Bray National Female School (Loretto Convent).

I am happy to assure you that such a report is perfectly false, as on all occasions I have had reason to be satisfied with the interest you evinced towards the school, your manner towards the children, and your exactness in seeing the regulations of the school observed.

When Mr. Kavanagh visited it upwards of two years ago, Miss Whyte, the mistress, and myself were the only persons to whom he spoke, and both of us can assert that no complaint of the kind was made to him.

Believe me, &c.
(signed) *Concepcion Lopez*, Manager.

(5.)

Convent of Our Lady of Loretto, Bray,
16 August 1858.

ON account of information received from our district inspector, J. Fleming, Esq., stating that he was rough and rude in his manners in Bray School, I take this opportunity of contradicting it, as I have always found him most polite and affable in my intercouse with him.

(signed) *Elizabeth White.*

(6.)

11, De Grey Terrace,
11 August 1858.

My dear Mr. Fleming,

With reference to your note of the 7th instant, and in reply to the inquiries contained therein, I have to state, first, that so far as I may be supposed concerned, I never gave any authority whatever, directly or indirectly, to Mr. Kavanagh to make the statement which you quote from his letter of July 1857, namely, that you had not "earned the good opinion of at least two of the head inspectors, under whose superintendence you had been placed previously to his becoming your head inspector;" nor did I ever say anything to Mr. Kavanagh which could be properly construed by him to imply that I had ever entertained any other than a good opinion of you, both as a private individual and as an officer of the Education Board.

On the contrary I can, in the second place, and in answer to your next query, most unhesitatingly affirm that I have always entertained, and, when occasion offered, as you yourself and others well know, have always expressed a very high opinion of your character and worth, considered both as an officer of the Board and as a gentleman and scholar.

Thirdly, as to what you quote from Mr. Kavanagh's letter, that soon after your appointment I had occasion to correct you for striking children in the school upon the head, I have simply to say that nothing that ever occurred in our intercourse, or which I ever spoke of its having so occurred, could justify the insertion of such a statement in the way Mr. Kavanagh has given it. The only incident, as I believe, to which this story can possibly allude, and which I may have related to Mr. Kavanagh, when speaking, as I have often done, both with him and other of my brother head inspectors, of the desirableness of our inspectors receiving some sort of preparatory instruction and training in the work of school inspection, before going out to assume the active discharge of duty, was a very simple one indeed; a mere innocent inadvertence on your part, arising entirely from your want of experience (for you had been then but a few months out), and which in no sense could warrant anything like the gross charge sought to be insinuated against you, that it was your practice to strike children on the head. I have accompanied you, in the years we were united, in the inspection of many, very many schools (weeks and months, on the whole), and at distant intervals we have been together, and never did I see you touch a child in a school but on one occasion (that which I suppose referred to), and then, as I have said, it was through mere inadvertence, not from heat or passion, or with a view to punishment, but simply to recall the child's attention to the lesson before it, and which, it seemed to you, it was, from giddiness of thought, neglecting. To say that I "corrected" you, in any proper sense of the term, on that or any other occasion of our official intercourse, is wholly inexact. Our mutual relations did not admit of that; and neither at that or any other time, so long as we were associated in the discharge of duty, did I ever feel prompted so to exceed my proper powers. What did indeed occur on the occasion I allude to, was a friendly interchange of thought, which ended in a few moments in mutual agreement as to the course proper to be observed by an inspector in his relations with the pupils of his schools; and that course, I have every reason to believe, you have since most faithfully followed.

As to the propriety of Mr. Kavanagh's producing in an official document, after the lapse of ten years, an incident so simple as that I refer to, and in producing it, misstating and exaggerating it as he has done, I shall say nothing, confident as I am that with every competent judge, with every man possessed of any sense of fairness or official propriety, there can be but one decision, and that, I am sure, will not be one of approval.

I remain, &c.

J. G. Fleming, Esq.

(signed) *W. M'Creedy.*

(7.)

My dear Sir, Londonderry, 12 August 1858.

I BEG to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 7th instant, and in reply have much pleasure in stating that during the entire time I had the pleasure of official connexion with you, your conduct and mode of transacting business have been most satisfactory. Since the first days of our acquaintance until the present moment, I have always had the most favourable opinion of you as an inspector and a gentleman.

I beg distinctly to state, that in any conversation I may have had with Mr. Kavanagh, I never expressed any opinion regarding you, either verbal or written, different from what I have already stated above. My intercourse with you both official and private has ever been most agreeable and satisfactory, and I have always observed that your status and character, as an officer of the Board, have been most praiseworthy and exemplary.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James Patten*,
Head Inspector.

J. G. Fleming, Esq.

(8.)

My dear Sir, 8 August 1858.

I HAVE received your note of the 7th instant, in which you state that Mr. Kavanagh, referring to your conduct as an inspector, has, in a communication of his to the Commissioners of National Education, asserted that he knows it to be a fact that you did not earn the good opinion of at least two of the head inspectors, under whose superintendence you were placed previous to the date of his becoming your head inspector.

In order to try and ascertain if I am one of the "two head inspectors" alluded to, you ask me the following question, "Did you ever authorise Mr. Kavanagh to make such a statement?"

In answer to this question, I beg to say that I never, by letter or in conversation, authorised Mr. Kavanagh to make such a statement.

Your second question is, "What is your opinion of my general conduct and character as an inspector, and as a member of society, so far as you are in a position to form a judgment on the matter?"

To the first part of this question, I beg to say that I always considered you an efficient inspector, and earnest in the discharge of your duty. I am aware that some exceptions have been taken to your conduct, but these, even if well grounded, would not modify the terms of my statement on this head.

Regarding you as a member of society, "so far as I am in a position to form a judgment on the matter" (to quote your own words), I believe you to be an honourable and a straightforward man. Of your social status, I know very little. I have had the pleasure of seeing you at least twice at my own table, and we have dined together on two or three occasions at hotels and at the houses of mutual acquaintances. This, as well as I can remember, constituted the whole of our intercourse, besides what was strictly official. I never expressed any opinion upon this subject to any one. Your social position never was, to the best of my recollection, discussed in my presence.

Yours, &c.
(signed) *W. H. Newell.*

J. G. Fleming, Esq.

Gentlemen, Wicklow, 3 August 1858.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of 31st ultimo, with letter enclosed, from Mr. Kavanagh, and dated 10th July 1857, on the Talbotstown case, to which you call my attention, for the purpose of furnishing any remarks I may have to offer in explanation or defence with reference to the statement set forth therein.

I shall begin by observing that Mr. Kavanagh, in the first part of his letter

of 10th July 1857, simply reiterates his original charge against me. He says, "Mr. Fleming found Mary Murray acting as substitute teacher when he visited the Talbotstown school in November 1855; that he found her actual teacher when he visited, March 1856; that on neither occasion did he examine as to her literary acquirements; that upon his report of the latter visit he had her removed, amongst other grounds upon want of acquirements, which he admits he did not test; and, finally, that on the manager protesting against the Board's decision, or rather against the grounds upon which it was made, Mr. Fleming again visited in August last, and, without any examination as to her attainments, recommends that the teacher get trial until the district examination of the teachers." One is led to think that Mr. Kavanagh had not read my letter of explanation (24/4/57), when he wrote the words just now quoted. In that letter I stated over and over again that I recommended Mary Murray's removal chiefly on the grounds of want of method, want of experience, inability to examine a class of children, and extreme youth. I saw she had no better notion of school-keeping than her little pupils whom she professed to teach. I saw she was but the nominal teacher of the Talbotstown school, and qualifying for her situation under a person named Anne Goss, who had just been dismissed from the Dublin Training Institution on a charge of theft, and therefore I recommended her removal. In short, this young person, about whom so much correspondence has taken place, was, in August 1855, a mere school girl, subsequently transferred in December of same year, and without the slightest preparation for the task, from her position as a fourth class pupil, to the responsible office of principal teacher in Talbotstown school.

Nor was it in the least necessary for me to make any remarkable effort of memory with reference to the nature and extent of her capabilities and mental qualifications. Her method of examining a class convinced me that her knowledge of grammar, geography, and especially of the Board's lesson books, was meagre and superficial in the extreme. Now, no one practically acquainted with the duties of school inspection is ignorant of the fact that an intelligent examiner will readily detect serious want of qualifications in the usual rudimentary branches on the part of a teacher, by the very nature of the questions which he puts to his pupils, and the answers he receives as such from them. A child, for example, under examination by his teacher, makes a gross error in parsing, in geography, or in explaining some passage of his reading lesson, and no attempt is made by the teacher to correct the error, and if necessary, to explain its nature to the class. Surely in such cases it is not unreasonable to conclude that a teacher is ignorant and unqualified. I am, indeed, far from supposing that the amount of a teacher's qualifications can be ascertained through the medium of so very imperfect a test; but I do say, that gross ignorance of any subject is quickly discovered in all cases similar to that which I have just described. This view I embodied in my last letter of explanation, dated 24/4/57, in the following words: "She (Mary Murray) knew nothing whatever of school-keeping. Her attempt to examine a class on the most rudimentary subjects was a complete failure, for the very obvious reason that she was wholly ignorant of the subject-matter of the Board's lesson books. This was quite apparent from the questions she put her pupils." It is indeed quite true, that I had not a complete conception of her literary attainments by means of a lengthened and special examination, but it is equally true that I had some knowledge of them, as any impartial person will clearly perceive from what I have just stated. All this is entirely ignored in Mr. Kavanagh's letters of 31 January and 10 July 1857, but his silence on so essential a point causes me no disquietude, because want of method, inexperience, and extreme youth, were the principal reasons urged by me, when recommending Mary Murray's removal from the Talbotstown school; not merely want of acquirements as he must have perfectly well known, from even a hasty perusal of my reports on that school. Regarding her age, I have nothing to add to what I stated on that subject in my letter of the 24th April 1857, when I mentioned she gave her age as 19 in the last week of November 1855, but being then only a substitute, acting temporarily in room of the regular teacher absent in training school, and certain to return in the course of three weeks, I thought it unnecessary to make any further inquiry regarding Mary Murray's age, seeing she was about to leave in so short a time. On my next visit, however (20 March 1856) I find her acting as regular teacher in the Talbotstown school, and I then make every effort in my power to secure satisfactory evidence as to her correct age, which

which she now returns only as 17 ½. I fail in doing so, for on referring to the entry of her age in the register * of the school, I found the original figures had been erased and fresh ones substituted in their place. This was the only erasure of the kind in the register, and this circumstance coupled with the contradictory statement of her age as returned by her in November 1855, and March 1856, led me to entertain grave suspicions of her veracity. I had some reason to believe her guilty of wilful prevarication and shuffling evasion in a very serious matter; but in the absence of clear and distinct proof, I could not act on mere suspicion, no matter how well grounded. I forwarded however for the information of the Commissioners, the page of the register in which I found the erasure of age referred to above, together with a brief statement of the necessary facts. I have in vain searched in Mr. Kavanagh's letter of 10/7/57, for any disproof or contradiction to this plain statement, which I now respectfully leave before the Commissioners for their dispassionate consideration.

Mr. Kavanagh mentions, in page 3 of his letter of 10/7/57: "The chief, almost the only thing, which the expected examination (of M. Murray) could test, is acquirements. * * * * * * Her age could not be affected beyond a month by the examination, and her inexperience of school keeping, the last of the three grounds of removal, would be in the same category. As to her age, numbers younger have been been trained and are highly classed, and some teachers very little her seniors have got charge of model schools; as to inexperience, it simply means that it is the first school of which she has been placed in charge, and if this were urged generally it would be self-destructive of the institution, or else teachers, as such, should not merely be immortal, but eternal." The principal points at issue between Rev. Mr. Nolan and me were: the amount of experience, knowledge of school-keeping, method of conducting and examining a class on the part of Mary Murray. I also urged her extreme youth as an objection to her appointment as principal teacher in a national school. Now, Mr. Kavanagh had ample opportunity for testing the reasonableness of all those objections when the girl presented herself for examination at the Dublin Training Institution, in January 1857. He was in a position to question her regarding her age, and to call upon her for some explanation as to the great discrepancy of her statements to me on that head, and the very suspicious fact of the erasure of her age in the register book (circumstances all fully detailed in my report of 20th March 1856, which Mr. Kavanagh had carefully perused before the examination terminated). But he did nothing of the kind; nor did he take the least pains to satisfy himself respecting her method of imparting instruction, by getting her to examine in his presence one or two classes in the adjoining training school. Neither did he make the slightest attempt to test her knowledge of school-keeping by a short but searching examination, which would not have cost him much trouble. He did, indeed, test her knowledge of the Lesson Books which she was presumed to have been teaching her pupils during the 18 months preceding the date of her examination in January 1857, and the result was that she failed to answer almost every question she was asked. I know that, in her written exercise, she did not answer a single question taken from the Lesson Books.

I am aware that a head inspector is not supposed to a have a personal knowledge of every teacher's method, previous to his examination and classification. Such information is usually obtained from the district inspector. But as Mr. Kavanagh declined to act on my opinion of M. Murray's method and knowledge of school-keeping, it was incumbent on him to satisfy himself, by a searching inquiry, of the fallacy and inaccuracy of that opinion. Strange to say, he never visited her school, he never examined her on school-keeping, he never heard her examine a class, although he knew very well that it was on account of serious shortcomings, under those two heads, that I recommended removal from the position of principal teacher in the Talbotstown School. And here I beg to express my disbelief that numbers younger than M. Murray have been trained and are highly classified, or that teachers very little her seniors have got charge of model schools. During my 12 years' experience as district inspector I never met with so young a person in charge of a school, either town

* Mary Murray was for some time a pupil in the Talbotstown School, and her age, when she was first enrolled as such, had been entered in the register in which a column is set apart for such entries of age.

town or rural. Neither is it necessary that teachers should be immortal and eternal; if unqualified, young persons are not occasionally permitted to take charge of some of the national schools. Surely Mr. Kavanagh cannot forget, that ever since his appointment as head inspector, the Commissioners have done all in their power to supply the losses arising from deaths, emigration, &c., in their teaching body, by creating a large staff of paid monitors, trained to the business of teaching in each of the school districts, by means of pupil teachers in the provincial model schools; and lastly, by the establishment of a special class of teachers from which school managers can at all times select efficient and experienced teachers.

Mr. Kavanagh writes, in page 4 of the letter from which I have already quoted, "It pains me beyond description to be obliged to lay bare before the Commissioners the utterly uncandid, to use the mildest form of words, conduct of Mr. Fleming in reference to the time when he expected the examination of the teachers of his district to be held. The written portion of the male teachers' examination for 1856 was held in Easter week, commencing March 24, and instructions were issued to furnish the papers, returns, &c., within a couple of weeks of that date. In July, instead of April, I received Mr. Fleming's men's papers, and in such a state of arrear, untidiness, and neglect, that on the 11th July I wrote to him informing him * * that the proper forms might be complied with." Mr. Kavanagh then gives extracts from my notes of the 14th July and 15th August 1856, apologising for omitting to fill up the teachers' dockets, and sums up in the following words: "I believe there can be no shadow of a doubt that when he had the interview with Rev. Mr. Nolan on the occasion of his visit to Talbotstown Female National School on the 13th August, he did not expect that the examinations would be held in August. * * * I got the papers filled so late that it was only on the 2d October that I was able to read over the results of the examination with him, with a view to decide on who were to be recalled to the oral examination."

First, as to the time Mr. Kavanagh received the teachers' written papers, I have merely to say that they had been properly marked and were lying for him in the office, Marlborough-street, long before the time he states. Had he written for them before July, they would have been forwarded to him in due course. Second, every answer in the teachers' exercises was most carefully marked; the papers and dockets placed in proper order before they reached Mr. Kavanagh. The dockets were not indeed filled up; a few hours, however, would suffice to do so. I left them blank, not from carelessness or neglect, but solely because I had always done so during my official connexion with Head Inspectors M'Creedy, Patten, and Newell, and for the express purpose of giving those gentlemen an opportunity to examine my marking of the teachers' answers before they were summarised and transfered to the back of the dockets. All this I mentioned to Mr. Kavanagh in my note of the 14th July 1856, from which he has given but a partial and garbled extract, and then adds: "I believe there can be no shadow of a doubt, that when he had the interview with Rev. Mr. Nolan, on the occasion of his visit to Talbotstown Female National School on the 13th August 1856, he did not expect that the examinations would be held in August * * * * I got the papers filled so late that it was only on 2d October 1856 that I was able to read over the results of the examination with him, with a view to decide on who were to be recalled to the oral examination."

I have it in my power to deal very summarily with this and similar assertions of Mr. Kavanagh as to the time when I expected the examinations for 1856 to take place. I received the following communication from him, dated, "Greystones, Delgany, 9 August 1856. I have revised the exercises of the masters who attended the written portion of the examination this year, and the following only are to be recalled to the oral examination:

	"N. Murphy, Probationer, Ballyfadd.
	P. Jones, Probationer, Wicklow.
	J. Davis, Probationer, Carrigower.
If report on his school be very fair.	J. Githens, 3^2, Rathmeigue.
Scarcely fit - - -	J. Keane, 3^1, Rathdrum, P. L. U.
	G. Byrne, 2^2, Trooperstown.
Hardly fit - - -	J. Lambert, 2^1, Arklow.
Rather weak - - -	G. Peyton, 1^3, Tinahely.

Of

"Of the 13 candidates for promotion, the exercises of eight of them are entirely below what would warrant their being recalled to the oral examination; unless fully 50 per cent. of the answers are marked satisfactory, or somewhat imperfect, we cannot recall them. Be so good as to let me know where it is most convenient that the men's exercises should be addressed to you, that the results of the written examination of each teacher be transferred to the back of his docket, as also a summary of the state of his school. * * * * Please let me have a list of the female teachers (schools and rank mentioned) whom you intend to summon to this year's examination, that I may fix the time for holding the examination, and while here put it over us."

I enclose the original document from which the above is copied. It places (I respectfully submit) beyond the pale of discussion all Mr. Kavanagh's assertions respecting the time when I had reason to believe he would have held the examinations for 1856. In his letter of 9th August 1856, he admits he has revised "the exercises of the masters who attended the written portion of the examination," and he actually names the teachers whom he wishes to have summoned to the oral examination, consequent on his own revision of the results of each teacher's written exercise, as marked by me. In his letter of 10th July 1857, he says, "I got the papers filled so late, that it was only on 2d October 1856 that I was able to read over the results of the examination with Mr. Fleming, with a view to decide who were to be recalled to the oral examination." Nor is this all. Mr. Kavanagh "is pained beyond description by my want of candour (to use the mildest form of words)," in stating to Rev. Mr. Nolan, on 13th August 1856, that his teacher's case would soon be brought under the head inspector's notice. He was then residing in the district, where he remained during the months of August and September. I therefore expected him to hold his annual examination of teachers some time in August, or at furthest in September, especially as I had his instructions of 9th August 1856 to let him "have a list of the female teachers whom you intend to summon to this year's examination, that I may fix the time for holding the examination, and while here put it over us." I sent him by next post the required information, and I naturally expected the near approach of the teachers' examinations, from the nature of the return called for, and from his expressed intention "to fix the time for the examination, and while here put it over us." But in his letter written in July 1857, he says, "There can be no shadow of a doubt that when Mr. Fleming had the interview with Rev. Mr. Nolan, on the occasion of his visit to Talbotstown Female National School on the 13th August 1856, he did not expect that the examinations would be held in August." Strange contradictions, which render it unnecessary for me to make further observations on this part of the case; and, indeed, after this clear and unmistakeable contradiction on the part of my accuser, as elicited from his own written statements, and that on a point the most material of his indictment against me, I might fairly close my reply, and, on the principle, "*ex uno disce omnes*," confide the case, as between my assistant and myself, to the Commissioners' impartial decision. I say I might fairly do this, and, according to all the rules of legitimate discussion, I submit I am entitled to do so, and here make an end. But I forego this right, and in deference to the Commissioners, and to satisfy them, as far as I can, on every point raised, I shall pursue the attack through all its issues. In doing so, however, I beg that it be carefully borne in mind that where I fail to produce other evidence than my own to countervail the assertions of Mr. Kavanagh, I am dealing with one whose testimony has been demonstrably shown to be unreliable. I am truly sorry that my position requires me to write thus, but as a matter of self-defence, and in bare justice to myself, I feel I can say no less.

In page 8 of same letter (10/7/57), Mr. Kavanagh writes: "About the 1st January 1857, I heard that Mr. Fleming had mentioned in the Education Office, that it was not then the examination should be held, and on meeting him in the grounds, in the presence of another gentleman, I mentioned to him what I had heard; and in reply he said he had no recollection of having so complained or expressed himself. I told him that 'if he had it would be not only untruthful but ungrateful, as the examination was about to be held in the place desired by him, and at the time agreed upon;' and upon this he remarked 'You certainly did promise to bring the teachers here about the vacation to oblige me, and if I complained as you were informed, it would be both untruthful

and ungrateful.'" Mr. Kavanagh had a conversation with me in the grounds (attached to the training schools), about the time he specifies, with reference to my complaint in the office, as to the time the examination should have been held. I regret very much that this conversation did not take place in presence of a witness. It was to the following effect. On casually meeting him in the grounds of the training school, he addressed me very abruptly; and, in a tone and manner I cannot call courteous, asked me, had I been making any remarks regarding the time for holding the examinations. I explained to him that I had made no complaint on the ground of any personal trouble or inconvenience to myself, but that I had expressed an opinion adverse to an arrangement requiring so many teachers to attend an examination in Dublin, during the most inclement season of the year, and necessarily at a considerable distance from their homes. I had just expressed a similar opinion in the Education Office in presence of several persons, one of whom mentioned the circumstance to Mr. Kavanagh. He then left me in the same abrupt manner he met me a few minutes previously, and apparently dissatisfied with my explanation. Nothing more occurred during our interview, the substance of which I have correctly reported. It is of course open to Mr. Kavanagh to produce any credible witness to disprove my statement; his account of a conversation he had with me about truth, gratitude, &c., is wholly imaginary.

In page 10 of his letter (10/7/57), he writes:—"August 13th, Mr. Fleming visited the Talbotstown Female National School, and in his report thereon recommended that 'it would be desirable to let Mary Murray remain as temporary teacher, but not recognised or sanctioned by the Board (and consequently without salary), until the examination of female teachers took place.' This recommendation," adds Mr. Kavanagh, "was not approved for some time, so that under any circumstances M. Murray could not, as Mr. Fleming well knew when writing his letter now quoted from, be summoned in the capacity of teacher before the month of September." The secretaries wrote to me in July 1856, requesting to know, were there sufficient grounds for granting Mary Murray a further trial. I replied in the affirmative, stating my reasons. I knew for certain that my recommendation in her favour would, in due course, be sanctioned by the Commissioners, although some delay might occur in sending me the document formally announcing their judgment. It is mere waste of time to dwell on such points. Every one acquainted with the rules of official life, knows that when a case is referred to the head of a department for his decision that decision, whatever it may be, is regarded as final by those who placed the case in his hands. It is therefore abundantly evident that after recommending in July 1856, Mary Murray for further trial, I was sure that if summoned to attend an examination in the following August she would be permitted to take her place with the other teachers. And I again repeat, with the knowledge of all the facts now before me, that if Mr. Kavanagh had held the examination in August or September, as he ought and might have done, she would have received her salary in due course, and the matter would have been arranged to the satisfaction of all the parties concerned. He tries to make such an opinion appear irreconcileable with my recommendation, "that Mary Murray should remain as temporary teacher, but not recognised or sanctioned by the Board (and consequently without salary) until the examination of female teachers took place." Now there is not the slightest inconsistency in this case. The recommendation just quoted was made in August 1856, before Mr. Kavanagh's very decided views on the Talbotstown case had become known. But surely I was justified, when writing my letter of April 1857, in presuming that his estimate of Mary Murray's age and general qualifications, so very favourable in January 1857, would have been sufficiently high in the preceding August or September to warrant him in recommending her for salary as a probationer, if not as third-class teacher. Such a contingency was, to say the least, extremely probable.

Nor is this the only instance of confusion of ideas in Mr. Kavanagh's letter (10/7/57). I wrote to him 9th August 1856, stating that I was then much occupied with the duties of inspection, which would detain me for some time in a distant part of my district. Hence he concludes that I did not expect the examination of teachers to take place in August or September. Why not? My letter (9/8/57) has reference solely to the business of inspection, which the district inspector is bound to suspend at any time his superior officer directs him

him to attend the examination of teachers. But I got no such command from Mr. Kavanagh, and I was therefore obliged by my instructions to proceed with the business of inspection. This clear distinction between the duties of school inspection and the examination of teachers, renders wholly abortive his attempt to show, from my own written testimony, that I could not have expected the examination of the teachers in August or September 1856.

He adds (page 7 of the same letter), "I left the place of its (the examination) being held to his own option;" and page 17, "Mr. Fleming wished the examination to be held in Dublin." These statements are clearly contradicted by the instructions conveyed to me in his letter of 9th August 1856, where he himself fixes the time and place for holding the examination. It is perfectly absurd to talk about my option in the matter. Mr. Kavanagh himself had no option in the matter. Of the 10 school districts under his superintendence in 1856, he had examined and classified the teachers of only three of those districts within that year; and with the same districts under his charge in 1855, he examined and classified the teachers of only one district in that year. Hence, to make up for lost time he was obliged to summon teachers from several districts to the same examination; thus getting through the legitimate business of weeks in a few days. Notwithstanding these facts, and his letter to me of 9th August 1856, he is not deterred from stating that his delay in holding the examination was owing to my carelessness and neglect. And here I am compelled to ask, Did I keep him back in his examinations of the year 1855, deferred by him to the year 1856? Did I interfere to prevent his proceeding in the summer and autumn of 1856 with those six other districts, the examination of whose teachers, as well as that of mine, he adjourned to the year following? Or is Mr. Kavanagh prepared to say of my six brother inspectors what he said of me, that it was their delay which caused the postponement? Or, lastly, was it through my obstructive influence he committed the same procrastination in the year 1857, when I was altogether dissociated from him in conducting the business of teachers' examination for that year? To these queries I know Mr. Kavanagh can return no pertinent reply, and therefore I submit that all he has said of me as interfering with the timely discharge of his duty in the matter in question, is but the tortuous pleading of one who seeks to screen himself at any cost from the consequences of his own culpable neglect of an important duty, by unscrupulously transferring the blame to another.

But "Mr. Fleming," he says, "wished the examinations to be held in Dublin." I distinctly recollect his intimating to me, towards the close of 1856, that it was his intention to summon my teachers to the Dublin examination. I made no objection to the arrangement. I knew it was perfectly useless for me to do anything of the kind; besides, as far as I was personally concerned, it mattered little whether the examination took place in Wicklow or Dublin. True, I "stopped in lodgings near Portobello," but the only business which brought me to Dublin was the special duty connected with the teachers' examinations, at which I had to assist, in compliance with Mr. Kavanagh's imperative instructions. I have to add, it was but a short time before the examinations were held that he informed of his intention to summon the male and female teachers to attend on the same days. He states, indeed (page 10, letter 10/7/57), I "had certain knowledge that the masters and mistresses are examined at the same period." Now the masters and mistresses are frequently examined at different periods, but never, to my knowledge, on the same day and in the same room by any of the head inspectors, exclusive of Mr. Kavanagh. He refers indeed to the examples of Messrs. M'Creedy and Newell, in regard to which I have merely to observe, that although officially connected with those gentlemen for more than eight years, I never knew either of them to examine the masters and mistresses on the same day and in the same room. But Mr. Kavanagh feels no hesitation in assembling together a large number of young men and women (most of them unmarried), at a considerable distance from their homes, in the centre of a populous city, with means at their disposal for dissipation, if so inclined, their travelling charges having been just paid them. I strongly object to such an arrangement, but he sees nothing wrong in it. My expression of opinion on the point he styles flimsy squeamishness. Yet, will it be believed, this gentleman, my censor who now, assuming the air of the robust moralist, ridicules me as one whose weak effeminacy of thought

arises from a somewhat suspicious pruriency of feeling, is the same who, when it served his purpose, made an attack on a brother inspector (Mr. Clarke), but through mistake as it afterwards turned out, and upon a wholly false assumption, for having, as he alleged, permitted a few monitors of both sexes (their average age hardly exceeded 14 years, and within easy distance from home), to be instructed and examined together under the immediate superintendence of one of the most respectable first-class teachers in the service of the Board. He at once denounces the supposed arrangement. "It is fraught with moral danger." Indeed! How then is it "flimsy squeamishness" to object to the practice of assembling together in the same room and on the same day large numbers of unmarried adults of both sexes, for the purpose of passing their examinations, unwarrantably deferred by him, and for holding which he had at his disposal the greater part, if not the whole, of the preceding summer and autumn.

It now remains for me to offer a few brief remarks on the remaining parts of Mr. Kavanagh's letter: and, first, with reference to Mary Murray's examination and classification, I have only to repeat what I stated in my letter of 24th April 1857:—"She is completely ignorant of the subject-matter of the Lesson Books of the Board. She failed in giving a satisfactory answer to any one of the questions taken from those books for the examination of probationary teachers. Her oral answering on the same subject was even worse. She failed in every subject (Arithmetic alone excepted) upon which she was examined." Mr. Kavanagh does not deny the accuracy of these statements, which if unfounded, or even exaggerated, he had it in his power to disprove or qualify, by producing the girl Murray's written exercises, and the records of her oral answering, which he had and still has in his possession. I referred to those documents in my last letter on the Talbotstown case, and called for their production. A rigid and impartial examination of the papers now indicated would quickly satisfy every unprejudiced mind that there were no grounds for stating "The question which we had to discuss was, should she not be placed, relatively to all our other decisions, on first division of third class."—Mr. Kavanagh's letter, 31/1/1857.

Detection of a Geography with Mary Murray at the Examination.—During Mr. Kavanagh's absence, on Wednesday 28th January, and while the female teachers were engaged with their written exercises, I noticed a book lying open on Mary Murray's lap. On my asking her for it she handed it to me, when it proved to be a copy of the "Geography Generalised," the questions on geography being then before her. This occurred in presence of my brother inspector. Several teachers were also witnesses of the circumstance. It is not, however, in the least necessary to seek their testimony, for the young girl, when questioned on the subject in my presence by Mr. Kavanagh, admitted, what indeed she could not deny, that she had a geography open on her lap, her exercises on geography being then before her. But he had no proof of her guilt, because, he says, "I had no evidence to satisfy me that she had used the book, and her paper on the subject shows that she had not, to help her in the examination." No evidence! Surely the testimony of two inspectors, eye-witnesses of the fact, was evidence quite sufficient to justify the most summary proceeding in the case. Her paper, indeed, did not indicate that she had used the book, because I required her to give it up before she had time to make any unfair use of it. Here is a young person openly detected, in presence of some 30 persons, in the very act of committing a serious offence which she had not time to complete. Therefore, says Mr. Kavanagh, there is no evidence of her guilt. Why? Because her paper on geography showed that she had not used the book. Such quibbles are below one's notice. Mr. Kavanagh was absent when the occurrence happened. He, nevertheless, undertakes to describe rather minutely what took place, but his description is not very intelligible. "I at once inquired," he says, "into the matter, and found that it had been brought by Miss Doyle, of Phibsboro', who volunteered the admission that she had never used it; that it was placed by her side on the form, and had fallen to the next step below, where Mary Murray sat, and that she, Mary Murray, had taken it up, and that Mr. Fleming had found it in her lap. I was displeased with Miss Doyle, as I could not see why she brought the book, except to use it; but, on the other hand, there was no evidence whatever that she had done so, and when the book dropped by Mary Murray I do not wonder

wonder at her taking it up." According to this account the book dropped from Miss Doyle's seat to the seat below, where M. Murray was sitting. Now every one then present will, if questioned on the point, state the very reverse of this. Mary Murray sat behind and immediately above Miss Doyle, who remained in the very front seat throughout the entire examination. It is quite useless to question the fact; there were too many persons present on the occasion, and if Mr. Kavanagh will only prove it to be otherwise, I shall at once give up my case as a bad one. The book, he says, dropped from Miss Doyle to Mary Murray, and next line or so, "when the book dropped by Mary Murray, I do not wonder at her taking it up." But taking into consideration their relative positions in the room, it was impossible the book could drop from Miss Doyle to M. Murray. To be brief, his attempted explanation of the occurrence is to me perfectly unintelligible; I can make nothing of it. But confusion of ideas must necessarily result from a futile attempt to twist facts in support of a foregone conclusion. I think it unnecessary for me to notice the unworthy insinuation that I detected the book with Mary Murray, because I had just been reading an anonymous, and not very flattering production, in the handwriting of her school manager. I never saw the letter Mr. Kavanagh speaks of until long after she had finished her exercise on geography (the first subject but one which is taken up by the teachers). He has not the slightest reason for supposing otherwise. It is simply a gratuitous assertion on his part, regarding a circumstance which occurred in his absence, and of which he knows nothing whatever.

Mr. Kavanagh adds, I was irritated beyond description on reading this note addressed to the secretaries. I certainly expressed my astonishment after perusing the document referred to, but the strong language employed by him to express how I felt on the occasion is exaggerated, in fact hyperbolical.

Short Notice of Examination of Teachers.—Mr. Kavanagh writes (p. 22 of his letter), "January 19th.—I met Mr. Fleming in the office, and apprised him that the examinations would be held on the 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th of same month; and his letter, dated Greystones, January 21st, stating that he had then summoned all of his teachers, is now before me. * * * * He had eight to 11 days, which was ample, as the result proved." I am in a position to set this question at rest by simply referring to his letter, written to me on the very day he specifies to have met me in the office. He writes, "Rathgar, January 19th, 1857.—In a post or two I shall give you notice to summon your teachers for examination. Meantime, you will let me know the precise number and rank of the female teachers whom you expect to attend." I enclose, for the information of the Commissioners, the original letter, now quoted from. It very clearly proves that Mr. Kavanagh is in error when he states he met me in the office on the 19th January, and apprised me the examinations would be held on the 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th January. Had such been the case, why write to me from Rathgar (directing his letter to Greystones), on the very same day (19th January); and, without making the slightest reference to any previous arrangement or conversation between us, intimate that in "a post or two" I was to receive the notice to summon the male teachers, which he now states he gave me on 19th January? Moreover, all the probationary and third-class teachers, nearly four-fifths of the actual number summoned, were required to attend on 27th or 28th January; hence even assuming all the notices to have been issued on the 21st or 22d January, to effect which the utmost postal despatch must have been used, it follows that my complaint regarding the shortness of Mr. Kavanagh's notice of the examinations remains fully established. Surely four or five days' notice was not sufficient, especially as the average length of the female teachers' journeys amounted to 50 miles, if not more, the distances travelled by the male teachers being somewhat less. It should also be borne in mind that in most instances the teachers' schools and homes are far from a post town and from their managers' places of residence, so that it often happens that communications, forwarded to teachers through the school managers, do not reach the former for several days after their delivery by the postmaster. In making the foregoing remarks, I refer solely to the teachers of Wicklow district. Mr. Kavanagh is quite correct in stating that he promised no decision of the Talbotstown case; but I, as the district inspector, and well acquainted with all the facts, promised the Rev. Mr. Nolan to have it brought under the special notice of the head inspector, for his final decision, on the

occasion of his general examination of the teachers; but that examination, which might and ought to have been held by Mr. Kavanagh during his two months' stay in my district (August and September 1856), was unnecessarily deferred by him, and consequently the final arrangement of Mary Murray's case indefinitely postponed, thus keeping the manager of the Talbotstown School in lengthened suspense on a subject, in which it appears he took a deep interest.

The observations made in the first part of this communication are, I respectfully submit, a sufficient justification of the course I followed in reference to the case now under discussion. I acted in the manner which seemed to me most judicious; and, from deep anxiety to avoid all grounds of complaint, I referred my proceedings to Mr. Kavanagh, for his final opinion. It proved to be very different from what I anticipated; but I at once bowed to his better judgment, and, of course, any suggestions from him as to my conduct in similar circumstances, would have received my most cheerful acquiescence. There the matter should have ended. He preferred, however, embodying a string of charges against me, in an official document, for what, under the most unfavourable construction, had been an error of judgment.

"The case of Anne Salmon, of Wicklow," writes Mr. Kavanagh (page 25, letter 10/7/57) "had not one single feature similar to, or in common with that of Mary Murray, of Talbotstown. * * * The one was in charge of a remote rural school in a mountainous locality, with an average attendance of about 30 pupils the other the head of a school with an average of 70. * * * Did I, when I had opportunity, forego the examination of the parties referred to, as Mr. Fleming had done in the other case? Not at all." Mr. Kavanagh suppresses a most important fact. He had deliberately decided on recommending the immediate dismissal of Anne Salmon and Emma Farrell before their examination took place. He expressed his determination to do so in my presence and that of the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan, of Wicklow, a gentleman who is prepared, if called upon, to corroborate my statement by the most distinct and positive testimony. It was perfectly understood by us both that Mr. Kavanagh deemed the removal of the parties now referred to, as absolutely necessary in consequence of their want of method and general inaptitude for the business of teaching; and these were the considerations which alone influenced him in recommending their dismissal, for he had not at the time tested their literary acquirements. In short, they were removed from their situations because (as in the case of Mary Murray) they were sadly deficient in method, and showed no aptitude for the business of teaching. There is, I admit, some difference between the cases of Anne Salmon and Mary Murray, the former being in every respect better qualified for the profession of teaching than the latter. The question of pupils' attendance in no way affects the main question at issue. Is it ever justifiable for an inspector to recommend the removal of a teacher whom he knows to be wanting in method and incapable of imparting instruction to his pupils, without first subjecting his literary acquirements to a rigid test? I believe such a course perfectly legitimate. There are hundreds of well-informed persons who would prove very useless teachers. Mere book knowledge, and the ability of imparting instruction to a large number of children, are very distinct qualifications.

Mr. Kavanagh states (same letter, page 28) four days were assigned for the examination of 36 teachers, summoned from districts 19, 22, 24, 21, and 35, the examiners consisting of himself and two first-class district inspectors. Further on, he adds, "I left the examination room close upon 12 o'clock, Mr. Coyle being then in the room as well as Mr. Fleming, and I returned before 3 o'clock, and remained examining until 6. * * * *. It is untrue that Mr. Fleming or Mr. Coyle had any undue, or even their proper share of the duty imposed upon them, and it is especially untrue that Mr. Fleming was left single-handed, as he states, to do anything, or direct anything, connected with the general proceedings of the examination. The production of the official record of the oral answering of both men and women will prove that no statement could be more opposed to truth than that made by Mr. Fleming, in reference to the manner in which the examinations were conducted." This certainly is strong language, to which I mean to offer no other reply than a brief summary of facts based upon evidence of the clearest kind. A reference to the classification sheets will prove that on the first day of the proceedings (27th January) nothing was done beyond

beyond getting through the oral examination of four male teachers, all of whom were in lowest class. There remained, therefore, but three days for the oral examination and classification of ten male teachers, all in a high class (2d or 1st, their examination consequently embracing 18 different subjects); and for the written and oral examination and classification of 22 female teachers; the marking of all their answers; summarising same on back of dockets; inquiring as to the state of their schools; and, finally, the calculation and payment of the travelling expenses of the entire 36 teachers.* On one of those three days Mr. Kavanagh admits he was absent for less than three hours; but he remained away for a much longer time, as I shall presently show. Mr. Coyle was also absent during early part of same day, in consequence of a severe cold. Hence it appears from Mr. Kavanagh's own admissions, that the entire duty of superintending the written examination of 22 female teachers, and the oral examination of 10 highly-classed male teachers, devolved upon Mr. Coyle and me during the three hours Mr. Kavanagh was absent on Wednesday, 28th January. Now, it was impossible for us to discharge this double duty at the same time in the way the Commissioners expected it to be performed.† The oral examination of 10 highly-classed national teachers is a very arduous and responsible task, the correct performance of which demands and absorbs all one's time, attention, and energy. Two inspectors are invariably required for such a duty; one to propose the questions, the other to mark the teachers' answers. All this clearly shows that a fatiguing and disproportionate amount of labour must necessarily devolve upon any examiner placed in a similar position to that in which Mr. Coyle and I were left during Mr. Kavanagh's prolonged absence on the day already referred to. He states, indeed, that it is especially untrue that I was left single-handed to do anything, or direct anything, connected with the general proceedings of the examination. On this point I beg to forward the subjoined evidence of Mr. Lambert, a most respectable 2d class teacher, who was present during the whole of the proceedings connected with the examinations of 28th and 29th January 1857. His testimony clearly corroborates my account of what occurred; it is not, therefore, necessary for me to further expatiate on this portion of Mr. Kavanagh's letter.

Mr. Lambert writes, "I have a distinct recollection of the following facts which took place at an examination of myself and other teachers, held in Marlborough-street on 28th and 29th January 1857: First, Mr. Kavanagh on entering the room in which the examinations took place, spent a considerable time in calling over the names of the teachers; ascertaining their respective classes; and arranging them in proper order for examination. When he had this part of the proceedings completed he retired, and did not make his appearance till late in the same evening, when he proceeded to pay all the teachers their travelling expenses. This he did by candlelight. I have not the slightest recollection of his taking any part in the examination, farther than asking a few incidental questions, whilst so engaged (for he sat at the same board with the examiners); but these questions formed no part of the examination, inasmuch as answering them procured no mark. I recollect having answered one of them myself (and one, like the generality of his questions, not connected with the programme), for which I got no mark. I distinctly recollect that the greater part of this day's business devolved on Mr. Fleming, for he was examining for some time, before Mr. Coyle joined him. I have no recollection whatever of any person assisting him, but I saw a young man," (one of the teachers examined the previous day,) "whom I did not know, furnishing the female teachers with pens, &c. * * * . I distinctly recollect that Mr. Fleming detected a violation of the rules to be observed during the examination, which took place amongst the female teachers, and to which he called Mr. Kavanagh's attention when he returned. Secondly, on the 29th, Mr. Kavanagh did not make his appearance till the examinations had continued for some time; he then took the examination of male teachers into his own hands, and continued it till the close of daylight. Thirdly, Mr. Kavanagh examined on this day on the following subjects—I am not positive as to their order: lessons

* Those teachers excepted who resided in Dublin, or its immediate vicinity.

† I entertain very little doubt that Mary Murray was not the only teacher among those engaged with their written exercises, who availed herself of the occasion to copy from books and papers.

lessons on reasoning, arithmetic, geometry and mensuration, algebra, book-keeping, natural philosophy. I am prepared to show that a teacher might thoroughly understand and distinctly remember the whole programme (school course), and yet not answer many of his questions. In arithmetic, he did not proceed beyond the compound rules. I am certain none of the questions he proposed on this subject were taken from any work published by the Board, I suppose they were taken from his own arithmetic, as he spoke a great deal about it at the examination * * * . I recollect having some conversation with Mr. Peyton of Tinahely, immediately after the examination; he fully agreed with me in my views of it." Mr. Lambert is, I beg to add, the only male teacher, now in Wicklow, of the four who were present from this district, at the examination of 27th, 28th January 1857. If called on, they will, I feel assured, corroborate to the fullest extent their fellow teacher's statements. I have also to observe that Mr. Lambert is not the only teacher who has expressed himself dissatisfied with Mr. Kavanagh's questions and method of examining on arithmetic. A pretty general feeling exists among those teachers whose opinions I have heard on the point, that his questions on that branch were not usually taken from the Board's text books, but (as Mr. Lambert opines) probably from his own work on arithmetic. He certainly spoke a good deal about it to the male teachers under examination on 29th January 1857, mentioning among other remarks, that they would shortly have an opportunity of procuring a copy of it at his publishers, who were then bringing out a new edition of the book.

Towards the close of his letter (10/7/57), Mr. Kavanagh enters into very lengthened details to show that he and I were on the most friendly and social footing up to the actual date of his letter of 31st January 1857. Without admitting or denying the accuracy of that statement, what, I ask, has it to do with our mutual official relations. Plainly nothing whatever; such matters should not be mixed up with the discussion of a simple question of official duty; but as Mr. Kavanagh forces the unpleasant topic on one's notice, I am obliged to set myself right with reference to some of his statements. He says (page 36 of his letter), "so anxious was I to serve him * * * , that on going down to Greystones last autumn, I brought with me a copy of Mr. Fleming's atlas, with the maps and text carefully revised by me. This copy I submitted to him; we went over the errors, which he thanked me for correcting, and I placed at his disposal expensive and most modern atlases and geographies to aid him in bringing out, as he promised, an improved edition of his little work." It is really painful to have to notice such petty trifles, wholly of a personal character, but I feel it due to myself to state, that the only alterations or errors in my atlas, pointed out to me for correction by Mr. Kavanagh, were, the substitution of the word bed for the word stratum, the necessity of giving more perfect and detailed statistical returns of the European States, the correction of some defects in the circles on the map of the hemispheres.

A comparison between the two last editions of the Atlas will show that the alterations and corrections referred to by Mr. Kavanagh are limited to those I have mentioned. He lent me during his stay in Greystones (August, September 1856) a copy of "Johnstone's Chemistry of Common Life;" but I never had from him at any time a single map, atlas, or work on geography, much less "expensive and most modern atlases and geographies." I must say that in all Mr. Kavanagh's lengthened communication of 10/7/57, I met with no statement more opposed to fact.

He writes (page 38 of his letter), "The last point in the whole case is that in reference to the absence of entry in the inspector's observation book at his visit in August, to explain the grounds upon which he founded his change of opinion as to the retention on trial, till the examination, of Mary Murray in the school. I did not make this statement without what appeared to me reliable evidence. Mr. Fleming does not deny the accuracy of the statement, and I have sent to the manager of the school for the observation book, which I shall send to the office." Reliable evidence! He does not produce a scintilla of evidence in the matter. He is formally asked to explain why he quoted from a public document, the observation book belonging to a national school, the original of which, or a copy of which, he had never seen. What course does he adopt? When challenged as to the propriety of such a step, he quietly sends for the book

to

to ascertain whether his remarks with reference to the entries it contains are correct or otherwise. But, "Mr. Fleming," he says, "does not deny the fact." I neither denied nor admitted the fact. The onus of proof lay with Mr. Kavanagh, and the plain question is not what I deny or assert in April 1857, but upon what grounds he quotes in January 1857 from a document which he never saw, a copy of which he never got, and of which he had no information whatever even of a verbal kind. The facts in this instance are strong and undeniable; it is impossible to explain them away by shuffling evasion and vain sophistry. Nor does Mr. Kavanagh explain why his quotation from Rev. Mr. Nolan's letter (dated 11th June 1856) is directly the reverse of what that gentleman really did write. He is equally silent on points 2, 3, in which I condensed the substance of my letter of the 24th April 1857, and which were submitted to him for explanation and reply. This is my last observation on the Talbotstown case.

It now remains for me to notice some strange allegations in the closing pages of his letter, where he re-opens the question of the want of consecutiveness, &c. in my entries in the observation books of Corrigower, and Barreneskey National Schools. As Mr. Kavanagh brings no new fact or argument in support of his original assertions, and as I believe he fails to invalidate the plain statement which I sent the Commissioners on 29th May 1857, in explanation of my entries in the observation books of those schools, I am content to leave this part of the case to the impartial and dispassionate consideration of those whose duty it is to review my conduct in the matter. In justice to myself I am bound to add that I never received any official notice from him on the subject of my entries in the books of the two schools now referred to. He spoke to me about them in a casual conversation I had with him on various other topics, and I gave him what I then believed he regarded as a satisfactory reply to his observations. He certainly never gave me the slightest reason to suppose he would, some six months afterwards, charge me with serious neglect of duty in reference to the Corrigower and Barreneskey schools. His course of action in these cases is, however, wholly beyond my comprehension. He visited the Corrigower and Barreneskey schools once, and only once, the former on 8th August 1856, the latter on 17th September 1856. In his confidential reports on those schools, he is required to give his opinion, for the special information of the Commissioners, as to the pertinency of the suggestions left by the district inspector during his visits to the school, thus specially examined by him, to ascertain how far the district inspector has fulfilled so essential a part of his duty. I have now before me copies of his reports embodying the results of his inspection of the Corrigower and Barreneskey schools. In both of these documents he replies affirmatively, and without the slightest exceptional remark to the following query: "Do the suggestions left by the district inspector seem pertinent to the state of the school?" This is his opinion in August and September 1856; but in the conclusion of a letter written on 31st January 1857, on some other subject, he finishes with these remarkable words, "I may here add, that I had to call Mr. Fleming's attention last autumn to some serious instances somewhat similar to this, in which he expressed himself in the strongest and most decided terms in the observation books, as to the unfitness of teachers; and in his next or subsequent reports in the book, the same parties being in charge of the schools, no explanation whatever is put forward to account for the change of opinion. The cases of the worst kind are Corrigower and Barreneskey." If those serious cases of inconsistency, &c. in my suggestions in the observation books of the schools, really existed, the worst cases of the kind being Corrigower and Barreneskey, why state in his confidential reports, written for the special information of the Commissioners in the preceding August and September, upon those very schools, that the suggestions left by me in the observation books were pertinent; "the school reports, as such, are unsuited for these matters." Perhaps so, but whatever their defects, they are admirably suited for ascertaining through the medium of a special query, whether the district inspector's suggestions are pertinent to the state of the school. If they be not so, it is clearly the head inspector's duty to report specially, and at the time, for the immediate information of the Commissioners, the worst cases of neglect. Plainly then, as regards this part of the case, if Mr. Kavanagh at the time he drew up the reports of August and September held the opinion of me, which he has since expressed, he failed in duty to the Board in not then recording it; but if his

recorded opinion of me then was that *bonâ fide* entertained by him, what are we to think of his subsequent charges?

Mr. Kavanagh writes (third, last page of his letter) as follows:—"Mr. Fleming challenges me to name a single instance of any other case of this kind, upon which I spoke to him, besides the two cited; and from mere memory, unaided by reference to my notes, I am able to do so—St. Kevin's National School. This paraded request to name another single instance is the less defensible, seeing that Mr. Fleming states he made an inspection for the special purpose of all the schools visited by me, and if so he must have been in St. Kevin's, as he well knew that I had visited it. On his visit, February 20th, 1856, he entered in the observation book, that the paid monitor (Michael Healy, appointed July 1854) was not qualified, and if not improved by next inspection that he, Mr. Fleming, would remove him. Now, in the subsequent visit of July 18th, there is not any reference whatever in the report in the observation book to the promised examination or to the qualifications of the same monitor, who was then in office." Mr. Kavanagh is quite correct in supposing that I visited St. Kevin's National School before I requested him to name the other schools in the observation books of which I expressed myself in the "strongest and most decided terms in the observation books, as to the unfitness of teachers; and in his next or subsequent reports in the book, the same parties being in charge of the schools, no explanation whatever is put forward to account for the change of opinion." In proof of this assertion he points to my remarks regarding the paid monitor in St. Kevin's National School. Now, a paid monitor is always a very young lad; in the case referred to, his age was under 14 years; he is a sort of apprentice to the teacher, but most assuredly he is not the teacher in charge of the school. No one knows better than Mr. Kavanagh that it has not been the district inspector's practice to make any remarks whatever in the observation book with reference to literary deficiency of the paid monitors. The Commissioners have placed in the inspector's hands a large book (ruled, and with printed queries on each page), in which he is required to record his opinions of the paid monitor's acquirements, literary proficiency, &c., ascertained by him at certain intervals by means of a special examination. My predecessors in charge of the district from 1846 till 1855, never made a single entry in any of the observation books of the schools, in reference to the case of a paid monitor. I did so, but only on one occasion; and I departed from the usual course followed by all other inspectors in charge of the district, for the following reason: the teacher of St. Kevin's school feeling that his young monitor, M. Healy, had not been sufficiently attentive to his private studies, requested me to make some entry in the observation book by way of admonition for his past neglect. This, I repeat, was an unusual course, but I complied with the teacher's request because I deemed it reasonable and prudent. I examined M. Healy on my next visit, July 1856, and subsequently in October of same year. I did not, it is true, record the results of those examinations in the observation book of St. Kevin's school, because that book was not intended for any such purpose. Consequently Mr. Kavanagh had no reason to expect he should find any entry in it respecting the paid monitor's examination. Therefore it still remains for him to answer my question, or challenge, as he calls it, and to name the other serious instances of inconsistency and want of consecutiveness in the suggestions left by me in the observation books of the schools under my superintendence.

Mr. Kavanagh states (page 41, letter 10/7/57) that, among other defects, "he pointed out to Mr. Fleming for correction the roughness of his manner to the children (specially complained of in Bray Convent National School)," adding, "This he should specially avoid, as, soon after his appointment as inspector, Mr. M'Creedy had to correct him for striking children in the school upon the head in Mr. M'Creedy's presence, during the examination of the classes;" and in reference to my statement in last page of my letter of 24th April 1857, "that I had always been fortunate enough to earn the esteem and good opinion of the several head inspectors under whose superintendence I had been placed," he remarks, "I know this statement to be not a fact in the case of at least two head inspectors, and I am not one of the two."

Mr. Kavanagh visited the Bray Convent National School, for the first time, some two years ago, during his stay in Greystones (August and September 1856). I believe his first visit occurred in August, and during my absence; his

his second and last visit, in the following September, when I was present all the time he remained in the school. On neither occasion, nor at any time, was the slightest complaint ever made of my conduct by any person connected with the Bray Convent School. On bringing Mr. Kavanagh's statement under the notice of the manager and the teacher of the school, the only parties he had any conversation with regarding the school, its arrangements, &c., they expressed the utmost surprise, and at once volunteered to contradict, in the most distinct terms, his most unwarrantable assertion. Mrs. C. Lopez, the manager of the school and superioress of the convent, thus writes: "Loretto Convent, Bray, 16 August 1858. I have been greatly surprised and pained to hear that any one could have reported that a complaint had been made of your rude and rough manner towards the children in the Bray National Female School of Loretto Convent. I am happy to assure you that such a report is perfectly false, as on all occasions I have had reason to be satisfied with the interest you evinced towards the school, your manner towards the children, and your exactness in seeing the regulations of the school observed. When Mr. Kavanagh visited it upwards of two years ago, Miss Whyte, the mistress, and myself were the only persons to whom he spoke, and both of us can assert that no complaint of the kind was made to him.—Mrs. Conception Lopez, Manager, Bray Convent National School."

Miss Whyte, the teacher, writes: "With reference to the statement that you were rough and rude in your manners in Bray School, I take this opportunity of contradicting it. I have always found you most polite and affable in my intercourse with you.—Elizabeth Whyte, Teacher, Convent, Bray, National School."

The following is Mr. M'Creedy's reply to a communication from me, asking him, first, whether he ever authorised Mr. Kavanagh, by word or writing, to state that I had not earned his good opinion and esteem when acting under him, in my capacity of district inspector, from the first day I had charge of a school district, July 1846 till 1853, when I was placed under the superintendence of Dr. Patten; secondly, To what extent Mr. Cavanagh was justified in using his name to support a statement to the effect that I had in his, Mr. M'Creedy's, presence, struck a child upon the head immediately after my appointment as inspector.

"11, De Grey Terrace, 11 August 1858. With reference to your note of 7th instant, and in reply to the inquiries contained therein, I have to state, first, that so far as I may be supposed concerned, I never gave any authority whatever, directly or indirectly, to Mr. Kavanagh to make the statement which you quote from his letter of July 1857, namely, that you had not earned the good opinion of at least two of the head inspectors, under whose superintendence you had been placed previously to his becoming your head inspector. Nor did I even say anything to Mr. Kavanagh which could be properly understood by him to imply that I had ever entertained any other than a good opinion of you, both as a private individual, and as an officer of the Education Board. On the contrary, I can, in the second place, and in answer to your next query, most unhesitatingly affirm that I have always entertained, and when occasion offered, as you yourself and others well know, have always expressed a very high opinion of your character and worth, both as an officer of the Board, and as a gentleman and a scholar.

"Thirdly, As to what you quote from Mr. Kavanagh's letter, that "Soon after your appointment I had reason to correct you for striking children in the school, and upon the head." I have simply to say, that nothing that ever occurred in our intercourse, or which I ever spoke of, as having so occurred, could justify the assertion of such a statement in the way Mr. Kavanagh has given it. The only incident, as I believe, to which this story can possibly allude, and which I may have related to Mr. Kavanagh when speaking, as I have often done with him and others of my brother head inspectors, of the desirableness of our inspectors receiving some sort of preparatory instruction and training in the work of school inspection before going out to assume the active discharge of duty, was a very simple one indeed, a mere innocent inadvertence, on your part, arising entirely from your want of experience (for you had been then but a few months out on duty), and which in no sense could

warrant anything like the gross charge sought to be insinuated against you, that it was your practice to "strike children on the head."

"I have accompanied you, in the years we were united in the inspection of many, very many schools; weeks and months on the whole, and at distant intervals, we have been together, and never did I see you touch a child in a school but upon one occasion, that, I suppose, referred to, and then as I have said, it was through mere inadvertence; not from heat, or passion, or with a view to punishment, but simply to recall the child's attention to the lesson before it, and which it seemed to you it was from giddiness of thought neglecting. To say that I corrected you, in any proper sense of the term, on that or any other occasion of our official intercourse, is wholly inexact. Our mutual relations did not admit of that; and neither at that nor any other time, so long as we were associated in the discharge of duty, did I ever feel prompted so to exceed my proper powers. What did indeed occur on the occasion I allude to, was a friendly interchange of thought, which ended in a few moments in mutual agreement as to the course proper to be observed by an inspector in his relations with the pupils of the schools, and that course I have every reason to believe you have since most faithfully followed. As to the propriety of Mr. Kavanagh's producing in an official document after the lapse of 10 years, an incident so simple as that I refer to, and in producing it misstating and exaggerating it as he has done, I shall say nothing, confident as I am that with every competent judge, with every man possessed of any sense of fairness or official propriety, there can be but one decision, and that I am sure will not be one of approval. —Wm. M'Creedy, Chief of Inspection, Dublin."

From 1853 till 1855, I was officially connected with Head Inspectors Dr. Patten and Dr. Newell. In reply to my queries—1. Did they ever in any way authorise Mr. Kavanagh to state that I had not, when acting under their jurisdiction, been fortunate enough to earn their good opinion and esteem; also, 2. Their opinion of my character as a public officer, and a member of society, Dr. Patten writes, "Londonderry, 12 August 1858. I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 7th instant, and in reply have much pleasure in stating, that during the entire time I was officially connected with you, your conduct and mode of transacting business had been most satisfactory. Since the first day of our acquaintance until the present moment I have always had the most favourable opinion of you as an inspector, and a gentleman. I I beg distinctly to state that in any conversation I may have had with Mr. Kavanagh, I never expressed any opinion regarding you, either verbal or written, different from what I have already stated above. My intercourse with you, both official and private, has ever been most agreeable and satisfactory, and I have always observed that your status and character as an officer of the Board, have been most promising and exemplary.—Jas. Patten, Head Inspector, National Schools."

Dr. Newell writes as follows:—"Dublin, 8th August 1858. I have received your note of the 7th instant, in which you state that Mr. Kavanagh, referring to your conduct as an inspector, has, in a communication of his to the Commissioners of National Education, asserted that he knows it to be a fact that you did not earn the good opinion of at least two of the head inspectors, under whose superintendence you were placed, previous to the date of his becoming your head inspector. In order to ascertain if I am one of the head inspectors alluded to, you ask me the following question, 'Did you ever authorise Mr. Kavanagh to make such a statement?' In answer to this question, I beg to say, that I never, by letter or in conversation, authorised Mr. Kavanagh to make such a statement. I beg to say that I always considered you an efficient inspector, and earnest in the discharge of your duty. Regarding you as a member of society, so far as I am in a position to form an opinion on the matter (to quote from your own words), I believe you to be an honourable and straightforward man.—W. H. Newell, LL.D., Head Inspector, National Schools."

It is necessary to mention, that my official intercourse with Dr. Newell ceased on 1st April 1855, from which date Mr. Kavanagh became my superior officer, and under his superintendence I remained till May 1857. But as Mr. M'Creedy, Dr. Patten, and Dr. Newell are the only head inspectors (Mr. Kavanagh, of course, excepted), under whose official control I acted from the first

first day I got charge of a school district till the present moment, their distinct contradictions to his statements affecting my character and position render it wholly unnecessary for me to pay them any serious notice. The same observation applies with equal force to his strange assertion, that my conduct was specially complained of in Bray Convent National School. All this should serve as a warning to Mr. Kavanagh to be more cautious in his attacks upon the character and reputation of others. He is doubtless aware that any one may set up his assertion against that of another, in which case an unscrupulous man will sometimes succeed in making the worse appear the better cause. Should he, however, in his hurry to run down an opponent, and in the heat of foolish recrimination, so far forget himself as to appeal to persons of honour and impartiality to endorse his gross misstatements, he cannot always escape an ignominious exposure of his want of truth and candour. With this reflection I conclude my case.

I think it right to enclose, for the information of the Commissioners, the original documents forwarded to me by Mrs. C. Lopez, Miss White, Mr. M'Creedy, Dr. Patten, and Dr. Newell; and I beg to add in explanation of the great length of this communication, that Mr. Kavanagh's letter, to which it is a reply, covers some 46 closely-written pages of foolscap paper. He introduces, it is true, a great deal of matter entirely irrelevant to the subject under discussion. I felt it necessary, however, to refute all his misstatements, point out his numerous exaggerations or suppressions of fact, and, when required by the nature of my defence, call attention to his own contradictions and inconsistent statements. Otherwise my silence on any of his minor charges might be assumed as an admission on my part of their truth. In drawing up my reply I have carefully confined myself to a clear, concise statement of facts, and to conclusions suggested by a careful consideration of documentary or other evidence of the most satisfactory nature. But I have sedulously eschewed all silly imputations of motive, vain recrimination, and unbecoming personalities.

I have only to express a sincere wish that my reply may be regarded by the Commissioners as satisfactory and conclusive.

I have, &c.
(signed) *J. G. Fleming.*

The Secretaries, Education Office.

Documents referred to in my letter of 3 August 1858.

Viz. 1. Letter from Mr. Kavanagh, 9/8/56.
2. „ „ 19/1/57.
3. Communication from Mr. Lambert, teacher.
4. Letter from Mrs. C. Lopez, Bray Convent.
5. „ Miss White „ „
6. „ W. M'Creedy, Esq., Chief of Inspection.
7. „ Dr. Patten, Head Inspector.
8. „ Dr. Newell, Head Inspector.

(signed) *J. G. Fleming,*
District Inspector of National Schools.

No. 1. (C.)

CORRESPONDENCE between the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools), and with Mr. *Cornelius Mahony*, District Inspector, relative to Mr. Mahony's recommendation for depressing Thomas Little, Teacher of Keash National School, from a higher to a lower class, from the 13th February to the 13th July 1857.

Office of National Education,
13 February 1857.

Sir,

WE are to call your attention to the following remarks made by Mr. Head Inspector Kavanagh upon the classification sheet, in which Thomas Little, the teacher of the Keash National School, is recommended for the third division of the first class:—

"This man was depressed in 1855, from 1^3 to 2^2, on a slightly unfavourable report on his school by Mr. Mahony, whose two previous reports, as well as those of the former inspector, were decidedly favourable. Mr. Mahony knew and felt, and states that the punishment was severe in the extreme, but he feared he would incur blame by so expressing himself to the office. Admonition is the usual punishment in such cases."

In connexion with the foregoing extract we subjoin statements taken from your report of the 21st April 1856, upon which the order of depression was made by the Commissioners :—

"Very indifferent reading. Bad pronunciation, which the teacher had evidently taken no pains to correct. A general deficiency in grammar and geography; much of the latter being the result of too high classification.

"Apart from teacher's classification, I can find no evidence of anything beyond the most ordinary capacity in the management of his school. He may be a good scholar, but he certainly is but an indifferent teacher.

"His method of conducting the school is not more successful than 3^1, or even than many 3^2 teachers. Whatever his acquirements may be, it is evident that he is wanting either in diligence or singularly deficient in ability to communicate instruction. He seems to have formed a very low estimate of what is to be expected from him, and there can be no doubt that he has been culpably inattentive to his duties. I have hesitated until now to express this opinion, though I had reason to form it at the previous as well as at the present visit. School is stationary; or, at best, progress so very far short of what might reasonably be expected from a teacher so highly classed and so well remunerated, that it cannot be said to be progressing."

Again, in your subsequent report of the 18th November, you furnish a return whereby it would appear out of 40 pupils present and examined, there was not one able to read the third or any higher book, not one knowing map of Europe or Ireland, and not one able to write a good hand with ease and freedom, while all would have appeared backward in meanings of words and subject matter of lessons.

You are now earnestly requested to give these extracts your serious consideration, and inform us if it was on your representations Mr. Kavanagh was led to form the opinion he has expressed.

You will also state at the same time whether Mr. Little was present at the written examination held in the past year, and, if not, by whose invitation he appeared at the oral examination of January 1857.

We remain, &c.
M. Cross,
J. Kelly, } Secretaries.

C. Mahony, Esq.,
Inspector, Carrick-on-Shannon.

DEPRESSION of *Thomas Little*, Teacher of *Keash* National School, County *Sligo*.

District No. 17, Carrick-on-Shannon,
21 February 1857.

Gentlemen,

IN answer to your communication of the 13th instant, directing my attention to the remarks made by Mr. Head Inspector Kavanagh on the classification sheet recommending the promotion of Thomas Little, teacher of Keash National School, and inquiring whether it was on my representation Mr. Kavanagh was led to form the opinion he has expressed, I beg to state (1), that I am certain Mr. Kavanagh arrived at the conclusion that this teacher's depression was "severe in the extreme" solely from an examination of my report of the 21st April 1856, upon which the order of depression was made; and (2), that his representation of certain views and feelings of mine relative to the case is not strictly accurate. Perhaps the most intelligible explanation I can give, and the best way I can comply with the instructions conveyed by your letter, is to state the whole transaction in detail.

A few days after this teacher's depression was notified to me I met Mr. Kavanagh in Dublin. He had received some communication (of the nature of which I am not aware) from the manager of the school, and he called at the office to examine my report on which the depression was made. Lest I may possibly have overstated the case against the teacher, I looked into the report along with Mr. Kavanagh. After a careful review of it, I assured him that I could not modify or unsay anything in it; that, as he seemed to be appealed to, I would be glad if he went down and examined the school himself, to ascertain how far I was right or wrong, and that if he did so I was confident he would pronounce my report to have erred most on the side of laxity. On reading over the report, he stated his opinion very decidedly and emphatically that it was so "slightly unfavourable" as not to warrant any penalty beyond a reprimand. It is evident that Mr. Kavanagh arrived at this conclusion solely and exclusively from the evidence supplied by the report. I am not aware that I gave expression to any opinion of my own at the time, and even if I did, it would be doing Mr. Kavanagh a wrong to suppose that he would take opinions second-hand from me. When I signified my readiness to do all in my power to have the case reconsidered, and asked him to recommend what had best be done, he said that he would call on me at the proper time to summon the teacher to the oral examination, "for special reasons," under the fifth head of the third general regulation for the examination and classification of teachers. Some eight or nine months afterwards, when conferring with Mr. Kavanagh about the oral examination to be held, he reminded me to have this teacher summoned to it; and upon my expressing a hope that he may deserve to be reinstated in his former rank, as I thought the depression was too severe a penalty, Mr. Kavanagh remarked that the right word should have come at the right time; that I ought to have written a remonstrance to the Office against such a sentence; and that throughout his long acquaintance with the institution he always witnessed the most cordial readiness to repair any wrong that may be done.

As to my writing on the subject, there were two grave difficulties in the way; first, the case had been taken up by Mr. Kavanagh, to whom I regard myself especially subordinate in all that relates to the classification of teachers. It came within his province more than mine; an appeal was made to him; he had instructed me how to act in the case, and he may naturally regard any further interference as unnecessary and unwarranted intermeddling on my part. Moreover, this depression was a type of a class which he and some of his colleagues regarded as striking at the root of head inspector's primary and essential prerogatives, classification having been awarded by a higher authority; upon a more searching inquiry, and being altogether a more solemn act than examining and reporting on a school, they looked upon it as turning the pyramid upside down to reverse the elaborate decisions of the court above, upon the hasty judgment of the court below, by depressing teachers from the rank which head and district inspectors had awarded upon the mere reports of district inspectors. Therefore, when questions above my sphere were involved it was not for me to interpose. Secondly, I did not see how I could appeal with propriety, from the Commissioners to themselves, against their own decision, when I had no new grounds on which to ask them to reverse it. If I could impeach the evidence

 furnished

furnished by myself, I would gladly have done so; but when I had told the truth, and scarcely the whole truth, to canvass the sentence would be an implied impeachment of the justice or judgment of the Commissioners in the sentence which they had based upon that evidence. It would be virtually asserting that I knew what was just better than they did. Differences of opinion as to the measure of penalty are scarcely avoidable, and though I may feel that an excessive amount was administered, in the present instance, it would scarcely be decorous in me to give expression to that feeling, whilst my function was merely that of a witness, to set myself up also as a judge and jury; and when the highest judicial authority that could be appealed to had passed judgment upon my testimony, to try to overrule its decision, and to shape and warp it according to my individual notions. If the matter, however, had not been taken up by Mr. Kavanagh, I would have advised the manager to request, and if he failed to do so, I would myself have requested, a reconsideration of the case, on the grounds that no previous warning, remonstrance, or admonition, had been addressed to the teacher.

It would appear from Mr. Kavanagh's statement, that I refrained from expressing my opinion through fear of incurring blame; whereas, that is only Mr. Kavanagh's own conjecture; and he had no reason for forming it, except that I stated to him in substance the difficulties which I have just explained. They are somewhat of a technical character, and whilst I feel the difficulty of putting my opinion officially on record, consistently with proper regard to subordination, I never imagined that the honest and respectful expression of my opinion, on a matter where justice was concerned, would incur the slightest blame. When Mr. Kavanagh believed that I was influenced by the moral cowardice of acquiescing in injustice, from any paltry, personal, or selfish consideration, he had a perfect right to say so; but he has fallen into a mistake in putting his own opinion, as an admission, into my mouth.

As a question has arisen about my opinion on the case, it cannot be considered disrespectful in me now to state that opinion plainly. I think the punishment would be anything but severe, if the teacher's inefficiency were persisted in; but, as it appears he never received any previous warning or admonition, I think it would have conduced more to his reformation, and be more in harmony with the general leniency and moderation of the Board's penal decisions, to have cautioned him first, and given him an opportunity of amendment, instead of visiting him with an immediate penalty. Perhaps I am to blame for not having reported upon his inefficiency at once, before I stated it so very decidedly in my report of the 21st April, but I had not evidence to warrant more than a suspicion; or, at least, my prepossessions were so strong in the teacher's favour, as may be seen from my former reports, that it required concise evidence of the strongest kind to shake them. But apart from any one's individual theories, the facts of the case, which are beyond dispute, are very plain; a first-class teacher, with a special endowment, is ascertained to be not more efficient than an average specimen of indifferent third class men. This is reported for the first time; till then he was unvisited by reprimand, warning, or penalty; whether his punishment, under such circumstances, ought to be immediate, or provisionally postponed, and the amount of it, immediately or remotely, are questions easily determined by the proper authority, according to its regulated principle of action.

With respect to my report of the 18th of November, subsequent to the teacher's depression—from which it would appear that his continued inefficiency is sought to be inferred,—I am bound to state that, low as the ascertained results of the examination of the 18th November are, they do not seem to me to afford evidence of culpable neglect. Most of the pupils examined had only just returned to school after an absence of several months. They were all too highly classed. Extravagantly high classification, disregard of elementary principles, and pushing those comparatively more advanced into exercises and subjects far beyond their comprehension, were the prevailing defects in the school. Solid advantages were sacrificed to the empty ambition of trying to work wonders, and whilst rearing up structures in the clouds the common-place work was despised, of laying a firm foundation on the solid earth below. For instance, one of the prodigies of the school who, I was assured, could analyse and parse the most difficult poetry, proved upon examination not to be able to distinguish the parts of speech. Those in 4th class, who were scarcely fit for 3rd, and whose depression

sion I recommended, were kept reading the most difficult lessons in the 5th book. Having been for many months unaccustomed to read at all, and being in the habit, whilst they were at school, of reading what they did not understand, it is to be expected that they could not read any book with intelligence. The same cause will account for their backwardness in meaning of words and subjects of lessons. I am of opinion, on the whole, that whatever is faulty in the school may be traced to injudicious management and crotchetty notions on the teacher's part, who, though he has had the benefit of training upon special class, seems to despise the ordinary modes of instruction, and fancies that he has hit upon some royal road of his own to knowledge.

Finally, I beg to state, in answer to your inquiry, that this teacher was not present at the written examinations held in this district last year, and that he was summoned to the oral examination by me in compliance with Mr. Kavanagh's instructions, directing me to summon him.

I have, &c.
(signed) *C. Mahony*,
District Inspector.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

Office of National Education,
14 May 1857.

Sir,

Referring to your communication of the 21st of February last, respecting the remarks made by Mr. Head Inspector Kavanagh on the classification sheet, recommending the promotion of Thomas Little, teacher of the Keash National School, we are again to return the classification sheet, and to inquire of you,— *Enclosure.*

1st. If the note inserted by Mr. Kavanagh at bottom regarding Little, was written before or at the time you attached your signature.

2d. If this note had your entire concurrence and assent.

We remain, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross*, *J. Kelly*, } Secretaries.

Cornelius Mahony, Esq.,
Inspector, National Schools,
Carrick-on-Shannon.

(District No. 17.)

Gentlemen,

Carrick-on-Shannon, 16 May 1857.

In answer to your communication of the 14th instant, enclosing the classification sheet of promotions recommended at the oral examinations held in this district on the 7th and 8th of January, and inquiring,—1st. Whether the note inserted by Mr. Kavanagh, with reference to the case of Thomas Little, teacher of Keash National School, was written before or at the time I attached my signature, and 2d. Whether that note had my entire concurrence and assent, I have to state :

1. That the classification sheet contained no such remarks when I signed it; that they must have been inserted some days subsequently to my signature, and after I sent back the sheet (which I retained two or three days after having signed it, for the purpose of transcribing into it some of the roll numbers and average attendances, as per last report), to Mr. Kavanagh for transmission to the Office ; and that I knew nothing about these remarks until I read them in your communication of the 13th February.

2. With reference to the inquiry, whether these remarks had my entire concurrence and assent, I beg to state, that I have not, directly or indirectly, concurred in or assented to them ; that a portion of them, at least, happens not to be exactly in accordance with my individual opinion, as I have already explained ; and that I would not have endorsed the statement when it was made, neither can I give an unqualified assent to it now, in all its particulars.

I have, &c.
(signed) *C. Mahony*,
District Inspector.

The Secretaries,
Office of National Education.

Sir, Education Office, 26 June 1857.

We forward you a copy of a letter of the 13th February last, addressed to Mr. Mahony, District Inspector, calling his attention to the remarks made by you in reference to Thomas Little, the teacher of the Keash National School, county Sligo, on the classification sheet of District 17, furnished in January last; also a copy of a letter from Mr. Mahony, in answer thereto, dated 21st February last; and two copies of letters subsequently written on the same subject, one to Mr. Mahony, dated 14th May last, and the other from him in reply, dated 16th May last.

You are requested to furnish, at your earliest convenience, any explanation you may have to offer as to the course pursued by you in reference to the teacher, Thomas Little.

We are, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross*, *J. Kelly*, } Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

Sir, Education Office, 10 July 1857.

We beg to remind you of our communication of the 26th ultimo, accompanied by copies of two letters from Mr. District Inspector Mahony, regarding the course pursued by you in reference to a teacher, T. Little; and we have to request that you will comply with our instructions without further delay.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, *James Kelly*, } Secretaries.

James W. Kavanagh, Esq.,
Head Inspector, N. S., Rathgar.

Keash National School Roll, No. , County Sligo.

Depression, by B. O., of Teacher *Thomas Little* from 1^3 (32*l.*) to 2^2 (24*l.*), on Mr. *Mahony*'s report (21/4/56); and recommendation of Mr. *Kavanagh*, Head Inspector, and Mr. *Mahony*, District Inspector, to restore Teacher to his former rank on 1st class.

Gentlemen,

For the first time I learn from your instructions of the 26th ultimo, that a correspondence has been going on with Mr. Mahony in reference to this case for upwards of four months. In compliance with your directions, I beg leave to state the course pursued by me in the matter, and in doing so I shall follow the precise order in which its several facts occurred.

Immediately after the depression of Mr. Little, the Board's order to that effect was advised to me in the usual manner; and about the same date I received a note from Rev. C. Cosgrave, P. P., manager of the school, complaining of this decision. I had not known nor do I know Rev. Mr. Cosgrave; and from the receipt of his note in May, until after the examination (held the following January), upon which his teacher was recommended for restoration, I purposely abstained from even acknowledging the receipt of that communication.

My impressions of Mr. Little's character were very favourable. He had been placed on first class, after an examination held by Messrs. M'Auley and O'Gallagan and me in 1854, and I regarded the punishment as unusually severe.

On my way to the office to examine the report or reports, which led to the depression of the teacher, I met Mr. Mahony (May 31, 1856) in the lawn, and told him the case as I had heard it. At my request, he accompanied me to the inspection office, where I examined with him his report, dated 21st April 1856, upon which the order for depression was made, and his previous reports of 19th November and 11th June 1855. I found that Mr. Mahony's two reports for 1855 were at least so far satisfactory that no admonition arose from them. I recollected that at the close of 1854 teacher was promoted on the combined grounds of attainments and efficiency, and it exceeded in severity all the instances

instances of punishment to teachers which had ever come to my knowledge, to depress a man by one-fourth of his income, upon a single unfavourable report of such a character. In answering the question, "Has the school improved or retrograded since last inspection?" Mr. Mahony, epitomising his opinions of the school, says: "School is stationary, or at best progress so very far short of what might reasonably be expected from a teacher so highly classed, and so well remunerated, that it cannot be said to be progressing."

I stated to Mr. Mahony, that as he admitted that the punishment was extremely severe, and as he did not expect that his report would bring anything beyond a severe admonition to the teacher, it was his bounden duty, on receipt of the advice of the Commissioners' order, to request a reconsideration of the case, with a view to modification of the sentence.

Mr. Mahony's statements as to any suggestion on my part to modify or unsay anything which he had said in his report, if he really means to state that I made any such suggestion, are simply without any foundation whatever. He made no recommendation, or gave no suggestion as to the form or amount of punishment, and to suggest to him to alter or modify the facts and opinions connected with his inspection of a school which I had never visited, is a line of conduct which I am incapable of pursuing. Mr. Mahony's statement that I arrived at the conclusion as to the severity of the punishment "solely and exclusively from the evidence supplied by the report" (26/4/56), is also quite incorrect, as I examined, in his own presence, his two previous reports upon the school. These reports (June and November 1855) brought me back to 1853 and 1854, and the close of the latter was the date of the teacher's promotion when Mr. O'Galligan reported most favourably of his worth as a schoolmaster. It is upon a consideration of all these, and not upon a single report, that my opinion as to the severity of the punishment was founded.

I know not how, or upon what grounds, Mr. Mahony can speak so confidently of the views of the head inspectors in reference to depressions of which this case is a type; and certainly it is not from me that he has heard any expression of opinion to warrant his becoming the exponent of our views in the matter.

The courts above and below, the pyramid, and the prerogatives, are all of his own creation, as are also the indecorum of interference, the judge and the jury. I am confident that I state the opinions of each of my colleagues as well as my own when I mention that I have never entertained views so utterly absurd as those put forward by Mr. Mahony. I believe that not only may, and should, teachers be admonished, fined, and depressed, but even dismissed on the reports, or even a single report, by a district or sub-inspector, according to the nature and circumstances of the delinquency. He (the court below) neither awarded, recommended nor suggested the depression; and the court above (the head and district inspector) were unanimous in their recommendation to the real and only court, the Commissioners, to reverse that decision.

The time for holding the examinations of the teachers arrived, and I directed Mr. Mahony to summon Mr. Little. Mr. Mahony stated his desire to see the man reinstated in his former rank, and also informed me that a report since made on his school was more favourable. I also requested that Mr. Little should bring with him to the examination both the observation books of his school, that I might fully examine into the recorded details of the working of his school for years back.

The teacher was examined on the 7th and 8th January last, and his answering was equal, as it had proved on a previous occasion, to first class. He had not attended the written portion of the examination (held in March 1856), because he was then on first class, and depression did not ensue until May; but he had attended both written and oral in 1854, when he proved his fitness in all portions of the course for the rank to which he was then promoted.

Not the slightest difference of opinion existed between Mr. Mahony and myself as to the recommendation made to restore the teacher to his former position. Respecting the observations made by me upon the classification-sheet, it is perfectly clear from their nature and phraseology that they were mine, and mine alone, and would have been entered there to explain the peculiarity of the case whether Mr. Mahony withheld or lent his concurrence to them. We had been up to a very late hour on Friday night (January 9th) marking the written exercises of the schoolmistresses, and classifying both sexes. On Saturday morning I wrote out the classification-sheets, and a few minutes before the

coach drove up (9½ o'clock, I think) in the morning, I sent for Mr. Mahony to sign the sheets; he was barely in time to do so, and a few matters (Roll Nos., &c.) requiring to be filled, I left the sheets in his hands for some days. On their being returned, I added, before sending to the office, the observations referred to, in order to explain the restoration of the teacher. In numbers of instances I have, when necessary, written observations of my own on the classification-sheets, sometimes with my initials annexed, and sometimes indicating by their matter that they were mine alone, and that the district inspector had no connexion with their composition.

Although they concur with Mr. Mahony, and not me, I think it right to notice the remarks made upon his report of the 18th November last in your letter to him, dated 13th February 1857. Any person reading the remark that "out of 40 pupils present and examined, there was not one able to read the third, or any higher book, not one knowing the maps of Europe and Ireland, &c.," would naturally understand that the 40 were expected to answer to these grades, whereas 10 of the children were classed in first, 13 in second, 12 in sequels (nine in the lower one), and only three in third, and three in fourth book. Now, as the three in third book may have been only recently removed thereto, the only pupils that you could expect necessarily to read the third book, as desired, were the three in fourth book. Inspector wrote of both classes in observation book (third and fourth), "These are too highly classed; they should at once begin the third book, be exercised on the meaning of each lesson, and receive frequent repetitions in the subjects of the lessons read by them. Their proficiency is generally fair, except in reading and explanation." From this you may perceive that the inspector was satisfied with the proficiency in geography, penmanship, &c.; in all, except reading (arising from over-classification, an error of judgment), and explanation. He also reports that the proficiency was fair in each of the first, second, and sequel classes; subject matter, and connected therewith, meaning of words, being the only other points below satisfactory.

I beg leave now to rehearse the main facts of this case. Thomas Little is 25 years of age, and was educated in Artane National School, and in the Central Model School, Marlborough-street. He was appointed to Newcastle National School in March 1850; placed 3^1 by Messrs. Butler and Mc Dermott in 1851; trained in the ordinary class 1852, and obtained 2^2 from professors, on special class in autumn 1852, and obtained 2^1, a higher rank very rarely given on clearing; appointed to Keash National School, November 1852; classed 1^3 in December 1854 by Mr. Mc Auley and me (Mr. O'Galligan), reporting that he should be recalled to the oral examination, and that his school was creditably conducted. This man had never received a reprimand of any kind, and the four reports on his school by Mr. O'Galligan were fair; the first two by Mr. Mahony were such as, at least, brought no censure, and at last an unfavourable report is made by Mr. Mahony. Without previous warning, admonition, or trial, this man, after six years' good character, is at once degraded two important steps, and deprived of one-fourth of his income. This I believe to be severe, and so far as I know, unprecedented. I took such steps to put the matter before the Commissioners as the nature of my office permitted, and I have left nothing undone to satisfy my own conscience that in making the recommendation for the restoration of the teacher's rank, to which the inspector fully agreed, I have *bonâ fide* grounds upon which to rest the case.

I remain, &c.

The Secretaries,
Education Office.

(signed) *James W. Kavanagh*,
Head Inspector National Schools.

P. S.—A few, perhaps six, since 1847, cases have occurred in which teachers were promoted who had attended the oral examination only, and several were dismissed thereupon. In the former class there were always strong reasons in favour of, or to justify it. The last case is that of the teacher of Balla Male, Sir R. L. Blosse's school, who was promoted from 2^1 to 1^3 on oral examination only.

Grenville, Rathgar, *1st July 1857. *J. W. K.*

* Received in the Office on 13th July 1857.

CASE of *Thomas Little*, Teacher of the *Keash* National School, County *Sligo*.

Ordered, THAT teacher Thomas Little be depressed to 2^2 class from 1^3 class from 30th April 1856, he being careless, negligent, and wholly unworthy of his present high rank. B.O. 9/5/56.

The foregoing order was made on the following statements in Mr. Mahony's Report on the School, dated 21st April 1856:—

Acquirements.—"Very indifferent reading. Bad pronunciation, which the teacher evidently had taken no pains to correct. A general deficiency in grammar and geography, much of the latter being the result of too high classification. Apart from his classification, I can find no evidence of anything beyond the most ordinary capacity in the management of his school. He may be a good scholar, but he certainly is but an indifferent teacher."

Method.—"Not more successful than 3^1, or even than many 3^2 teachers. Whatever his acquirements may be, it is evident that he is wanting either in diligence or singularly deficient in ability to communicate instruction. He seems to have formed a very low estimate of what is to be expected from him, and there can be no doubt that he has been culpably inattentive to his duties. I have hesitated until now to express this opinion, though I had reason to form it at the previous, as well as at the present visit."

State of School.—"Stationary, or at least progress so very far short of what might reasonably be expected from a teacher so highly classed and so well remunerated, that it cannot be said to be progressing."

It would appear from Mr. Kavanagh's letter of the 1st July, that information of teacher's depression was communicated to him by the Rev. Mr. Cosgrave; that after receipt of this communication Mr. Kavanagh, accompanied by Mr. Mahony, called at the office, examined the report of which extracts are given above, and then determined to summon Little to the annual examination.

It is here to be observed that Mr. Little had not attended the written examination of teachers for 1856, and was not therefore entitled in any way to be called to the oral examination; Mr. Kavanagh, therefore, in summoning him to the oral examination, departed from the usual course.

Second, it is to be observed that Mr. Little was not depressed for incompetency or want of scholarship, but for inefficiency and want of success as a school-keeper; and therefore Mr. Kavanagh's summoning him to the annual examination, where his competency alone could be tested, was not at all the course to be adopted in the circumstances, as, no matter what the results of such examination, Mr. Kavanagh could furnish no proper grounds to the Commissioners for altering their decision.

Mr. Little having attended the examination, Mr. Kavanagh and Mr. Mahony forwarded his name on the classification-sheet, and recommended him for restoration to his former rank.

On his classification-sheet appeared the following note, apparently the joint production of Mr. Kavanagh and Mr. Mahony, the sheet on which it was inserted bearing their joint signatures:—

"This man was depressed in 1855 from 1^3 to 2^2 on a slightly unfavourable report on his school by Mr. Mahony, whose two previous reports, as well as those of the former inspector, were decidedly favourable. Mr. Mahony knew and felt, and states, that the punishment was severe in the extreme, but he fears he would incur blame by so expressing himself to the office. Admonition is the usual punishment in such cases."

Three things ought to be noted with regard to this memorandum—

1. That apparently it purported to be the joint production of Messrs. Kavanagh and Mahony.

2. It characterises the report of the 21st April, from which extracts are given above, and on which teacher was depressed, as "slightly" unfavourable.

3. It states that Mr. Mahony was deterred from appealing against the decision of the Board by the fear of incurring the blame of the Office.

As to the first, Mr. Mahony not only denies all participation in the memorandum, but states that it was inserted subsequently to his giving his signature. That it is not in accordance with his individual opinion, and that he could not therefore have endorsed the statement or given it his unqualified assent.

And Mr. Kavanagh himself admits now that he inserted the note after Mr. Mahony had attached his signature to the sheet.

As to the third, Mr. Mahony himself, in his letter of the 21st February last, denies that Mr. Kavanagh had any reason for the statement, and that he, Mr. Mahony, never imagined that he would ever incur the slightest blame from the Office for the honest and respectful expression of his opinion.

With regard to the second point, the extracts given above speak for themselves.

Finally, as bearing on the question of the teacher's merits as a school-keeper, the following extracts from Mr. Mahony's letter of the 21st February, a copy of which Mr. Kavanagh had before him when he wrote his of the 1st July, are to be considered.

Mr. Mahony states of Little, though "a first-class teacher, with a special endowment, he is ascertained not to be more efficient than an average specimen of indifferent third class men," and again :

"Extravagantly high classification, disregard of elementary principles, and pushing those comparatively more advanced into exercises and subjects far beyond their comprehension, were the prevailing defects in the school. Solid advantages were sacrificed to the empty ambition of trying to work wonders, and whilst rearing up structures in the clouds, the commonplace work was despised, of laying a firm foundation on the solid earth below. For instance, one of the prodigies in the school, who, I was assured, could analyse and parse the most difficult poetry, proved upon examination not to be able to distinguish the parts of speech. Those in fourth class, who were scarcely fit for third, and whose depression I recommended, were kept reading the most difficult lessons in the fifth book. Having been for many months unaccustomed to read at all, and being in the habit whilst they were at school of reading what they did not understand, it is to be expected that they could not read any book with intelligence. The same cause will account for the backwardness in meaning of words and subjects of lessons. I am of opinion, on the whole, that whatever is faulty in the school may be traced to injudicious management and crotchetty notions on the teacher's part, who, though he has had the benefit of training upon special class, seems to despise the ordinary modes of instruction, and fancies that he has hit upon some royal road of his own to knowledge."

24/7/57.

No. 1. (D.)

CORRESPONDENCE between the Commissioners of National Education in *Ireland*, and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools), and with Mr. *J. G. Fleming*, District Inspector of National Schools, relative to the Appointment of a paid Monitor in the *Ballynacarrig* National School, County *Wicklow*, from the 10th March 1857 to the 12th of August 1858.

Sir, Education Office, 10 March 1857.

WE enclose you a letter of the 2d instant from the Rev. R. Galvin, of Rathdrum, stating that there is great necessity for a monitor in the Ballinacarrig National School, and requesting a reconsideration of the case with a view of having a successor to Dowdall appointed.

Your opinion as to the propriety of appointing another monitor in this school as successor to Dowdall is requested at your earliest convenience. You are to return the enclosed when answering this letter.

We are, &c.

(signed) *M. Cross*,
J. Kelly,
Secretaries.

Jno. G. Fleming, Esq.,
Rathdrum.

Roll, No. 3,551. Ballinacarrig National School, Vested, County Wicklow; Manager, Rev. R. Galvin; Teacher, John Byrne.

Gentlemen, Rathdrum, 9 May 1857.

I BEG to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 10th March last, requesting my opinion as to the propriety of appointing another monitor in the Ballinacarrig National School as successor to Denis Dowdall. I have also to acknowledge the receipt of Rev. R. Galvin's note (enclosed in your communication of 10th March), requesting a reconsideration of the case, and a further trial to John Byrne, teacher of the Ballinacarrig National School, by allowing him a successor to Dowdall.

Dowdall acted as paid monitor in the above-mentioned school till January last, when he was removed (B. O. 16/1/57); Mr. Kavanagh, head inspector, having reported him as "unfit for his office; and as the head inspector further stated that the Ballinacarrig National School is not conducted in a manner suited to the training of a monitor, the secretaries directed me not to recommend the appointment of a successor to Dowdall."

A few explanatory remarks regarding the attendance, method of teaching, &c., adopted in the Ballinacarrig National School, will materially contribute to place this case in a clear, correct point of view.

The Ballinacarrig National School is situated in the centre of a large rural population, consisting, with some inconsiderable exceptions of farmers, dealers, and agricultural labourers in full employment. These people are for the most part in comfortable circumstances for their position in life, and are, generally speaking, anxious to have their children educated.

As there are no other schools but those of Rathdrum in connexion with the Board within three miles of Ballinacarrig National School, the attendance of the latter, especially from the month of May till harvest, is very large, averaging nearly 90 for the summer months.

The teacher, John Byrne, was appointed to the Ballinacarrig School in 1844; he was soon after trained, and his promotion to first-class took place in 1851, when he was examined with other national teachers in Tinahely by Messrs. Butler and Davitt. No teacher in the district works more assiduously or with greater energy than Byrne in the discharge of his duty; he has, the manager informs me, at all times used his best exertions to improve the children placed under his charge.

These circumstances had doubtless due weight with my predecessors, Messrs. Molloy and M'Creanor, both of whom deemed Byrne a person suited "for the training of a monitor." Accordingly in the year 1853, Mr. Molloy appointed James Dowdall as paid monitor in the Ballinacarrig National School.

James Dowdall resigned in 1854 to take the charge of the Killaineron National School as temporary teacher, when Mr. M'Creanor appointed Denis Dowdall to succeed his brother (James Dowdall) as monitor in the Ballinacarrig National School.

Shortly after this, Mr. M'Creanor left the Wicklow district, and when I, as his successor, first visited the Ballinacarrig National School, I found D. Dowdall acting in it as paid monitor. I examined him on two different occasions during the year 1855, and in both instances I found him lamentably deficient in literary acquirements. He could neither write nor spell, and his knowledge of grammar, geography and arithmetic was meagre and superficial in the extreme. I consequently felt it my duty to give him a special caution that he would be dismissed unless he acquitted himself in all respects more creditably at next examination. His answering, however, at that examination, which took place in November 1856, was so bad, that Mr. Kavanagh, as I anticipated, recommended his removal.

That step was, I believe, imperatively called for, as all hope of proficiency on Dowdall's part was at an end. Considerably more than a year had elapsed between the date of his first and last examination, yet on both those occasions his answering was most unsatisfactory.

The boy was in fact so dull, heavy and stupid, that his teacher's incessant efforts to improve him were all in vain; and I quite concur with Rev. Mr. Galvin in thinking "that he could never be trained to become an efficient monitor."

Dowdall's gross ignorance was doubtless a valid reason for his removal from the situation of paid monitor; but it by no means followed that because Byrne, his teacher, had not been successful in training a boy as monitor who was sadly

deficient in natural abilities, "that the Ballinacarrig National School is not conducted in a manner suited for the training of a monitor."

This statement of Mr. Kavanagh took me quite by surprise, for after his inspection of the Ballinacarrig National School in September last, he gave it as his opinion that "it was one of the neatest, cleanest, and best kept country schools he had ever visited." This remark evidently applies to what may be regarded as the material of the school; but Mr. Kavanagh appears to have been so much pleased with the general satisfactory and efficient state of the Billinacarrig and Rathdrum Boys' National Schools, that upon his recommendation the manager of them, the Rev. Mr. Galvin, was specially complimented in a commendatory letter from the Commissioners for the general efficiency of the national schools under his management. A complete set of the Board's books, with a copy of the annual reports, all neatly bound in cloth, accompanied the complimentary letter referred to, in accordance with Mr. Kavanagh's suggestions.

There are (see margin *) eight national schools under Rev. Mr. Galvin's management; the first five of these Mr. Kavanagh never even saw; he could not tell from his own observation whether they were thatched or slated, in good or bad repair, how provided with books, apparatus, &c.; he was, I may add, equally ignorant regarding the qualifications of the teachers in those schools; in short, for all practical purposes Mr. Kavanagh was no more in a position to form any opinion from his own inspection or knowledge of those five schools, Mucklow, Macreddin, male, Macreddin, female, Claravale, and Glenmalur, than if they had been in Canada or Australia, and under the superintendence of Mr. Robertson or Mr. Davitt. He felt justified nevertheless in recommending the manager, Rev. Mr. Galvin, to be specially complimented by the Board for their general efficiency.

I beg to observe, with respect to the three national schools under Rev. Mr. Galvin's management, which Mr. Kavanagh visited, that the first, Rathdrum, male, was everything that could be wished for, the teacher being one of the best in the district, and some 30*l.* having been paid by the Commissioners in July last for repairs, painting, inclosure of play ground, &c., as the Rathdrum school-house is vested in the Board. The second school, Rathdrum, female, was, when jointly inspected by Mr. Kavanagh and me in September last, in a very low state of efficiency. The following is the entry in my district book as the result of my inspection of the Rathdrum Female National School on 22/9/56: "School retrograded since last inspection, junior classes especially; first-class very backward; industrial teaching low; answering on grammar, geography and arithmetic only middling." This opinion was quite in accordance with that of Mr. Kavanagh, as may be seen by comparing our reports of 22/9/56 on the Rathdrum Female National School. Ballinacarrig, the third and last school under Rev. Mr. Galvin's management which Mr. Kavanagh visited, is officially declared by him to be conducted in such a manner as not to be suited for the training of a monitor.

The sum of all this appears to be, that Mr. Kavanagh first recommends that a complimentary letter and a set of the Board's books be sent to the Rev. Mr. Galvin for the general efficiency of the national schools under his management, eight in number.

Five of those schools Mr. Kavanagh never saw; one, the Rathdrum, male, which he inspected, left nothing to be desired; a second, the Rathdrum, female, which he also inspected, was, at the time of his visit, in a very low state of efficiency; and the third, Ballinacarrig National School, which he reported upon last, is stated by him to be conducted in such a manner as not to be suited for the training of a monitor.

Thus, B. O. 24/10/56, compliments Rev. Mr. Galvin on the general state of efficiency of all his schools, while B. O. 16/1/57, states that one of these very efficient schools referred to in B. O. 24/10/56, is conducted in a manner so unsatisfactory as "not to be suited for the training of a monitor."

It may be well to remark that Mr. Kavanagh paid but one visit to the Ballinacarrig National School; and, I may add, that he inspected but one school in this district (Trooperstown, manager H. Grattan, Esq.) since September last.

Official

* 1. Mucklow. 2. M'Creddin. 3. M'Creddin, female. 4. Glenmalur. 5. Claravale. 6. Rathdrum, male. 7. Rathdrum, female. 8. Ballinacarrig.

Official praise and censure thus hastily awarded must eventually become valueless in the estimation of school managers, who cannot be supposed to attach any weight to opinions formed upon insufficient grounds, and contradictory in their nature.

I beg respectfully to add that Mr. Kavanagh should have paid more than one hurried visit to an important and largely-attended school before he reported it as not suited for the training of a monitor, especially with the fact before him, that the same school had been regarded by three successive district inspectors as suited for that purpose. The united experience of those inspectors (Messrs. Molloy, M'Creanor and self), extended over a period of several years, and their numerous, regular and incidental visits to the Ballinacarrig National School during that lengthened period afforded ample opportunity of forming a pretty accurate opinion of the teacher's (J. Byrne) capabilities.

Mr. Kavanagh, however, after one short visit of 2 hours 15 minutes' duration to the Ballinacarrig National School on 23/9/56 (when there were upwards of 80 pupils present, and a considerable portion of his time necessarily devoted to the scrutiny of the school accounts, examination of paid monitors, &c.), sets aside the matured opinion of three district inspectors, whose coincidence in the same view was, to some extent, a proof that their decision was judicious and correct.

I may be asked what has all this to do with the subject-matter of the secretary's communication of March last, requesting to know from me, "Is it proper to appoint another monitor in the Ballinacarrig National School, as successor to Dowdall?" I beg most respectfully to reply, that in my mind every word I have written in this case is absolutely necessary. For if, as Mr. Kavanagh states, the Ballinacarrig National School is not conducted in a manner suited for the training of a monitor, it follows that during the last two years I have allowed an incompetent teacher to have the charge of a paid monitor. Now this neglect (supposing it proved) of one of the most important duties of a district inspector, the judicious selection of suitable schools for the training of monitors, could only have arisen from extreme carelessness, or else from the want of ability on my part to distinguish an efficiently conducted school from a bad one, or to select the intelligent, competent teacher from the unqualified and indolent of his class.

I feel, however, entitled to hope that the statements and explanations given in this communication will satisfy the Commissioners that neither of those suppositions in any way applies to my official conduct.

It is, I feel, very necessary for me to state that I am far from regarding the Ballinacarrig teacher, J. Byrne, as a person in all respects suited for training a monitor. He invariably acquits himself indifferently in the presence of strangers in consequence of extreme nervousness, which, in his case, amounts to a species of disease. When called on by the inspector to examine a class, he becomes quite agitated; the man's frame literally trembles from feverish excitement, which, however, soon subsides if no notice be taken of it, and if he be allowed to get on by himself and without any interruption; but when he commences to examine a class, his manner is nervous, anxious, and hurried. He repeats over and over again the words of his questions to the children under examination; but, as I have already remarked, he becomes calmer and more settled in manner if quietly left to himself.

I am free to admit that I never considered Byrne's method of teaching very good. I stated in my last report on his school, "He (Byrne) is deficient in method, and fails when examining a class to express himself with that clearness and precision of language which, as a first-class trained teacher of more than 12 years' experience, he should have long since acquired."

All this is quite true; but it is equally true that Byrne is as well, perhaps better, qualified to train a monitor than some other teachers in this district, who still retain their monitors; and, it is but just to add, that when speaking of his method as deficient, I judged him by the standard of his class, which is 1^3; and although he does not fully come up to that standard, he is, at all events, equal to 2^1. As such he is of course entitled to the services of a paid monitor, since the Commissioners sanction the appointment of a monitor in a good school under a teacher in 3^1.

The teachers of the St. Kevin's and Bray Male National Schools are merely in second class, and have been reprimanded more than once for neglect and inefficiency.

ciency. Mr. Kavanagh inspected those schools last autumn, when C. Brown, teacher of the Bray National School, was severely admonished on his report, 6/8/56. The same teacher was also admonished on my report, 31/1/56, for disorderly conduct of pupils, and fine threatened. St. Kevin's National School was until last year in a very unsatisfactory state, and the teacher, C. O'Rorke, was severely reprimanded on a former report of mine.

Both these teachers have improved their schools within the past year, and have, consequently, been permitted to retain their monitors. The same kind consideration should, I respectfully recommend, be extended to Byrne of the Ballinacarrig National School, for he has ever been a faithful, zealous and hard-working teacher. As such, apart from his lengthened period of service, in his school, he deserves well of the Board. If allowed another paid monitor as successor to Dowdall, he will, I feel satisfied, redeem his character, for Dowdall's failure at the last examination of monitors was not, I know, owing to any neglect or inattention on the part of his teacher.

It is most important to observe, that although the teacher, Byrne, certainly anticipated his monitor's removal, he was very far from expecting that Mr. Kavanagh would have reported his school as "conducted in a manner not suited for the training of a monitor." The head inspector never made any intimation of that nature to me or to the teacher; on the contrary, after Mr. Kavanagh had ascertained that Dowdall was wholly unqualified for the situation of paid monitor, he himself, in my presence, and in presence of the teacher, J. Byrne, pointed out a young lad named John Radcliffe, one of the pupils present, as a proper substitute for Dowdall, who, it was understood, should be removed.

All this occurred on 23d September last, during Mr. Kavanagh's inspection of the Ballinacarrig National School, which he never subsequently visited, nor did he ever see or examine the teacher, Byrne, since the date specified above. Strange to add, Mr. Kavanagh states some three months afterwards that this same school "is not conducted in a manner suited for the training of a monitor," although, it is unnecessary to add, from the fact of his naming John Radcliffe as a fit person to act as a monitor in it, he must have believed it to have been conducted in a manner "suited for the training of a monitor."

I beg to remark, that this case would (in all probability) have never been brought under the Commissioners' notice had Mr. Kavanagh, as I believe he was bound to do, communicated with me before signing the paid monitors' dockets, recommending gratuities to their respective teachers. My signature was, I believe (in accordance with the official regulations), to have been attached to those documents. Mr. Kavanagh, however, dealt summarily with each case without conferring with me about it.

Such a course of proceeding is unjust to the teachers, for the district inspector may often be in a position to state circumstances in favour of the teacher which might alter or mitigate an unfavourable opinion on the part of the head inspector. This remark specially applies to those teachers whose schools had never been visited by the head inspector.

An example at hand amply illustrates my meaning. Mrs. Murray, teacher of the Hacketstown Female National School, county Carlow, got no gratuity for her care and instruction of her paid monitress, M. Snell, for the past year. Now Mrs. Murray's school is the best girls' school in the district (*see* my reports and those of sub-inspector Barrett); she has left nothing undone to improve her monitress, who is a giddy, idle girl, and pays little or no attention to her teacher's advice and tuition.

In this instance, a most deserving and efficient teacher is, I respectfully submit, unfairly punished. Had the case come before me for an opinion, I would have recommended the dismissal of the idle, inattentive monitress, and the payment of the gratuity to the zealous, painstaking teacher.

Strict adherence to the Commissioners' regulations regarding the examination of and signatures to the paid monitors' dockets will prevent a recurrence of cases similar to that now detailed for the information of the Board.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *J. G. Fleming,*
District Inspector.

The Secretaries,
Education Office.

Sir, Education Office, 16 July 1857.

An application having been made to this office by the Rev. Richard Galvin to appoint a successor to Denis Dowdall, late monitor in the Ballinacarrig National School, who was dismissed on a report of yours, stating him to be unfit for his office, and the matter having been referred to Mr. Fleming, district inspector, he has forwarded to us the enclosed letter.

As Mr. Fleming, from his knowledge of the teacher, considers the statement made by you, "that the Ballinacarrig National School is not conducted in a manner suited for the training of a monitor," quite unwarranted, and at variance with your formerly expressed opinion of the same school; and as he further passes certain remarks as to the treatment generally by you of the schools of his district, we are to request that you will furnish, at your earliest convenience, any observations you may think necessary to make in reference to his statements.

When answering this communication you are to return the enclosed.

We are, &c.

(signed) *M. Cross*, *J. Kelly*, Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 28 July 1857.

In compliance with your instructions of the 16th instant,* I beg leave to make the following observations upon the two points referred to in your letter:

1. You state, "Mr. Fleming, from his knowledge of (Mr. John Byrne) the teacher considers the statement made by me, 'that the Ballinacarrig National School is not conducted in a manner suited for the training of a monitor,' quite unwarranted, and at variance with my formerly expressed opinion of the same school."

I visited and examined this school, September 23d, and found 82 pupils present; Mr. Fleming accompanied me. We met the manager that day in Rathdrum, before our visit to Ballinacarrig. I examined some of the classes, Mr. Fleming others, and I had the teacher to examine and teach before us. I beg to refer you to my report upon the school. You will find it highly favourable as to the house, premises, furniture, fittings, order, cleanliness, &c.; and unfavourable, in many respects, so far as the answering of the pupils is concerned. You will find it reported, that the teacher's manner is nervous and excitable; that his method is rather superficial; that his mode of examining is of the same character, and not testing; that his aim goes no higher than to inform or instruct; but that, on the whole, his general fitness as a teacher for that school is pretty fair. I have not seen the report since I sent it to the office in September; I think, however, you will find this a correct summary of it. The master's wife, a very intelligent woman, acts as workmistress, and has done so for the last eight years, and she also assists in the care of the junior classes. Dowdall, the monitor, was examined by me; and Mr. Fleming and the teacher both interposed to prevent me from recommending his immediate removal, praying that he might get a last trial.

The average daily attendance for the year ending 31st August 1856 was 55,† (males 32, girls 23,) and during that year never amounted to nearly 90 for some months,

---

* My letter in reference to the paid monitors was dated 3d January 1857; Secretary's letter to Mr. Fleming on same, dated 10th March 1857; Mr. Fleming's reply thereto, dated 9th May 1857; Secretary's letter forwarding same to me, dated 16th July 1857; my reply thereto, dated 28th July 1857.

† 1855:

	Men.	Female.	Total.
September	33	21	54
October	34	24	58
November	29	18	47
December	21	13	34
1856:			
January	27	18	45
February	26	15	41
March	23	20	43
April	31	21	52
May	42	33	75
June	43	34	77
July	42	31	73
August	30	23	53
Average	32	23	55

Average 69

months, or for any month, as stated by Mr. Fleming (page 2); but even if it had, it is on average attendance for some period, year, half year, &c., that grants are made, and not on a maximum number for a short time.

The school had failed in the two years (from 10/54) that Dowdall was paid monitor, to make anything of him, and the inspector failed to remove him as unfit. In the four inspections of the school made by Mr. Fleming previous to our visit in September last, there is no record in the observation book warning both teacher and monitor of the great deficiency of the latter. The entries at the first three of these visits (July and December 1855, and April 1856) are scant and meagre in reference to the school; and the only record respecting the fourth inspection (21/5/57) is the date and hour at the head of the page. Although the school is in the parish, and within three miles of the inspector's official residence, six months after the supposed distribution of the new observation books, it was not then supplied with a copy, nor was the copy found at previous visits filled. The irregularities of this kind which I found arose altogether from the itinerant squatting, for I can call it by no better name, of the inspector, between his three centres, Graystones, Rathdrum and Kiltegan. He kept neither house, lodgings, conveyance, office,* nor fixed place for managers or teachers to call on him; but in oriental fashion, struck his tent when the official duty was done in one locality, minimised his personal and official baggage, and removed to another place in the district. This I mentioned last year to one of the secretaries, and some two months since to the resident Commissioner.

When Dowdall's answering came before me, I at once, from his deficiency, and from his previous examination by myself, recommended his removal, which Mr. Fleming should have done at some of his visits to the school, if he examined the boy; and upon this no difference of opinion arises on the part of manager or inspector. But upon the docket I added, "School is not conducted in a manner suited to the training of a monitor;"† and thereupon Mr. Fleming devotes 12 pages of laboured composition to refute this opinion, and also to show an inconsistency in my conduct.

The grounds upon which that opinion are founded are these: First. The school is conducted by a first-class master (32 *l.*) and his wife (the daugher of a national, I think, teacher), who not merely acts as workmistress, but also as literary assistant, although only paid (8*l.*) in the former capacity; and to an average attendance of 55 pupils (32 boys and 23 girls) this teaching staff is ample. Second. The school is conducted rather as two separate schools under two teachers (save as to the senior girls, who join the boys' classes) than as one mixed school under one teacher. Third. The master's manner and temperament, arising, as I have no doubt, from constitutional causes, are not such as to suit him as an example to a monitor for four important years of his life. Fourth. His method of teaching and examining is faulty, but not to the extent that upon this alone I would refuse him as a monitor. And lastly, the monitor granted to it failed in two years to be made anything of. Also, the services of a paid monitor are wanted more in many other schools in the district; thus, whilst there are really two teachers in Ballinacarrig, with an average attendance of 55, it can have no claim for the further grant of a monitor, compared with Trooperstown in the same parish, with an average of 40, under an excellent first-class teacher, and conducted in a manner admirably suited to the training of one. Again,‡ at Ballinahinch National School, under a teacher 3^{l}, who, although not trained, has one of the best-taught country schools that I have examined; average attendance 39: it has far higher claims than Ballinacarrig.

You now see, gentlemen, the clear and distinct grounds upon which my opinion that a monitor should be refused to Ballinacarrig is founded, and you now understand what I meant when I stated that "the school is not conducted in a manner suited to the training of a monitor." This is my opinion now; and I recommend

---

* Not even a depôt. The Rathdrum National School (male) is used for the purpose, and the parcels belonging thereto are the only untidy feature in that neat school.

† Mr. Fleming glosses this statement by repeated assertions, which imply that "it is conducted in a manner so unsatisfactory as not to be suited for the training of a monitor" (page 6); whereas the school may be fairly taught, and comparatively efficient, and yet not so conducted as to be suited to the training of a monitor.

‡ *See* reference to this in my report, 29/10/56, upon Trooperstown National School; even the eleven unpaid monitors in it are remarkably smart and apt teachers.

recommend that the place be assigned to a suitable person in Trooperstown National School.

Respecting the alleged inconsistency in my opinions, there is none whatever. It is untrue that on the occasion of my visit I named or suggested a successor to Dowdall; but it is quite true that I pointed out the absurdity that so deficient a lad should be retained, seeing that several of the boys, and one especially, were his superiors in the class.

The constructive charge of inconsistency, attempted to be inferred from my recommendation that the Board should mark, by the presentation of a set of their books, with a complimentary letter, to Rev. Mr. Galvin, upon his zeal in advancing the interests of the national schools in his parish,* and upon their general efficiency, is quite in consonance with Mr. Fleming's whole character, as lately exhibited in my letter of the 10th instant.

My attention was first called by Mr. Fleming himself to the excellence of the Rathdrum National Schools; and, many months before I visited them, he sent the teacher, Mr. O'Neill, to my house in Dublin, soliciting me to visit them, that I might ascertain O'Neill's claims for higher promotion, as to a district model school. I spent two days examining the boys' school, and a day in the girls' (Mr. Fleming with me in the latter), and Mr. Galvin was present at the chief portion of my examination of the boys. The schools are the neatest I have ever been in in Ireland—vested in the Board—but Mr. Fleming adds, this, if not a reproach, at least to detract from the managers' merit, in reference to their condition. The grant from the Board was applied to the shell, &c., of the house, but did not extend to the fittings, &c., of the schools. The boys' school was on the whole in the highest state of efficiency; and the girls' school, under a new teacher, who had been only three weeks in office, pretty fair. I am much surprised at the wilful *suppressio veri* respecting the female school. Mr. Fleming examined, July 11th, 50 pupils present, and Anne Reynolds, 1[2] teacher of school; his report in the observation book is on the whole decidedly favourable. Anne Reynolds leaves the school at the end of that month, and goes to Wicklow National School; Rev. Mr. Galvin applies to Mr. Fleming to recommend him a suitable successor; but while the matter is pending, Mr. Galvin writes to Mr. M'Creanor, late inspector, and he sends him Miss Reid, from the Clonmel district; and thereupon Mr. Fleming complains to me of the want of courtesy showed to him in the matter, and views Miss Reid with no very favourable eye. September 1st, Miss Reid enters upon her duties, vacation having been given after Miss Reynolds had left for Wicklow; and Mr. Fleming now quotes his report of an examination, held three weeks after her appointment (22/9/56), as derogatory to the teacher. Compare his report of July 11th with that of September 22d, and consider the change of teachers, and also the intermediate vacation, and some falling off should reasonably be expected.

Next the Ballinacarrig school was visited, which in neatness, cleanliness, order, &c., leaves nothing to be desired, and on the whole is a good country school.

Next Trooperstown, which although nominally under the managership of teacher's father (a farmer), is really under the moral management of Rev. Mr. Galvin, who frequently visits it, and feels just as much interest in it as in any of the schools of which he is regular manager. This I examined, and with Mr. Fleming. I visited it on a previous occasion, and reported on it (16/9/56); it is an excellent school, and I was very happy to promote the teacher to first class.

Next the workhouse school (girls) in Rathdrum, which I visited; and so far as I could judge from an inspection of the penmanship, witnessing how the business was conducted, &c., I was much pleased with it, and Rev. Mr. Galvin takes a lively interest in its working.

I spent several hours with Mr. Galvin while examining the Rathdrum National Schools, and heard his views and opinions upon popular education. I had never met the gentleman before. I visited five schools in his parish, and fully examined† four of them; and further, I found that not merely in the schools of his own

---

* Please attach that letter to this for reference as to the terms upon which I made the recommendation.

† The inspection of one was both before and after the date of the letter to the Board.

own parish, but the report books of those in adjoining parishes, attest his zeal and interest in education elsewhere; all this I know of my own knowledge.

Before I forwarded to the Board the recommendation to compliment Rev. Mr. Galvin, he was the frequent topic of conversation with Mr. Fleming, as almost "the ideal" of a school manager; he stated matters to his credit which are unfit for official report, and represented his appointment to that parish as one of the best acts ever done by Archbishop Cullen. I may add, that his Grace visited the Rathdrum Schools, and expressed himself very favourably as to their condition. Mr. Fleming stated to me again and again that Mr. Galvin's example, his activity about the schools, and the condition in which he keeps them, exercise the most beneficial influences upon the neighbouring clergy. When praising the cleanliness, neatness, &c., of the schools in that parish which I visited, Mr. Fleming assured me that, ont he whole, all the rest of Rev. Mr. Galvin's schools were equally well cared and kept. In addition to all this, before I forwarded that letter I had minutely (as Mr. Fleming too well knows) examined his district book, which was in my hands for over a week; and as Mr. Fleming admits that his memory is bad, the shortcomings which I found therein written on its front page will remind him of the fact, and of the date of the examination. Now, interested as I felt myself, and increased as this was by Mr. Fleming's report about the schools in Rev. Mr. Galvin's parish, I examined the reports of them as recorded in the district book. You now see, gentlemen, that my recommendation was founded upon the fulness of knowledge; and take up my letter, and you will not find an allegation in it not strictly correct.

If I had seen and examined but a single national school, as lately in the case of Balla, county Mayo, it would have been my bounden and gratifying duty to commend its manager, if he aided in having it conducted with credit and efficiency, to the notice of the Board; but in the case of the Rev. Mr. Galvin, I examined four schools, and visited another in his parish.

Mr. Fleming does not, I hope, correctly estimate his own veracity and judgment when he so ignores his testimony, both oral and that recorded in his official books, as to state that I was "unable to know from my own observation, whether some of the schools were thatched or slated, in good or bad repair, &c." "In short, for all practical purposes, that I was no more in a position to form an opinion, from my own inspection of five of the schools, than if they had been in Canada or Australia, and under the superintendence of Mr. Robertson or Mr. Davitt." There might be point and pertinency in this nonsensical flourish, if I had ever stated, directly or by implication, that I had any knowledge of the five schools referred to, as derived from my own inspection of them, or if that knowledge entered into or was a necessary element to warrant me in the recommendation made. Mr. Fleming got his first place as clerk, and his present situation, not upon actual examination of him (except in penmanship) in the strict sense, but upon presumed reliable testimony as to his fitness and attainments. Commissioners that never saw him inspect a school, and the greater number of whom do not know his very personal appearance, promoted him a grade in his class; and even had I no evidence, beyond reliable report, I would vote a set of books to a manager on evidence upon which we vote tens of thousands of pounds in salaries to teachers, of whose schools the head inspectors have no knowledge from personal inspection.

Of the 10 schools* in Rev. Mr. Galvin's parish, I visited five; examined fully and reported upon four of them; and had ample opportunity, from Mr. Fleming's own lips, and from a minute examination of the several reports upon the other five, and indeed upon all, as recorded in the district book, to learn their condition in all respects. Mr. Fleming was fully aware of every one of these facts when writing the following comment, upon my recommendation that the Commissioners should compliment Rev. Mr. Galvin: "Official praise and censure thus hastily awarded must eventually become valueless in the estimation of school managers, who cannot be supposed to attach any weight to opinions formed upon insufficient grounds, and contradictory in their nature." There is as much truth however in the passage as there is in many of the statements by him which I had to refute lately on another subject, or as there was in the statement which he made

* Rathdrum National Schools.—1. Rathdrum, male. 2. Rathdrum, female. 3. Ballinacarrig. 4. Trooperstown (inspected and reported on 10/9/56, and further examined and reported on 29/10/56). 5. Rathdrum, P. L. U. 6. Macreddin, male. 7. Macreddin, female. 8. Claravale. 9. Mucklow. 10. Glenmalur.

made to me, that his predecessor left no Paid Monitors' Registry after him in the district (see my letter, 3/1/57); whereas Dr. Newell on a late occasion found that the book had been left, and was lying in the usual depôt, the National School, Rathdrum.

I dismiss that subject with assuring the Commissioners that I intimated to Mr. Fleming my intention to recommend that Rev. Mr. Galvin be complimented, that it had Mr. Fleming's warmest approval, and subsequent to its passing the Board, that he informed me it was a wise and proper step.

2. In your letter of the 16th instant, you state that Mr. Fleming "further passes certain remarks, as to the treatment generally, by me, of the schools of his district;" and you also call on me to make any observations which I may think necessary thereon. After a very careful perusal of Mr. Fleming's letter of May 9th, I am unable to find any remark deserving of notice except the following:—

Page 7, he says, I "ought to have paid more than one hurried visit to an important school like Ballinacarrig." The hurried visit lasted two hours and twenty minutes; two inspectors examined; and I state with the fullest confidence, that at a moment's notice I can furnish fuller, more important, and more reliable information respecting that, or any other school that I have inspected in the district, than he, the local officer, can, and of the truth of this assertion he has ample proofs. On the day in question I visited five other national schools, in every one of which I did some duty, how small soever the amount; Rathdrum, male and female (2), and Poor Law Union (3); and Newbridge, male and female (5).

Not only does Mr. Fleming lecture his superior officer, and call him to task for the manner in which he discharges his duties, but while seeming to do so, in the following instance it is really the Commissioners and the official regulations that are on their trial. Page 11, he states: "This case would (in all probability) have never been brought under the Commissioners' notice, had Mr. Kavanagh, as I believe he was bound to do, communicated with me before signing the paid monitors' dockets recommending gratuities to their respective teachers. My signature was, I believe (in accordance with the official regulations), to have been attached to those documents; Mr. Kavanagh, however, dealt summarily with each case, without conferring with me about it." I quite agree with Mr. Fleming that his signature should have been attached to the dockets, but surely he does not expect me to do that duty, which he should have done when sending up these documents; and its absence is complained of by me in my letter of January 3d, addressed to you thus: "I forward herewith paid monitors' dockets of District 35 for 1856, noted and signed by me, but wanting the signature* of the district inspector." Mr. Kavanagh did not deal summarily, or in any other than the prescribed manner with each case; and it is a waste of the public time to have me employed replying to his ignorant remarks in reference to the essential portion of his own routine duties.

In the case of the Hacketstown Female National School, Mr. Fleming (page 12) accuses himself that he allowed a giddy idle girl to remain as monitor under a deserving teacher, to whom she paid little or no attention, whose advice and tuition she disregarded, and who left nothing undone to improve her. He thus deprived the school of the benefit of the services of a proper monitress, the mistress of the gratuity to which she would doubtless be entitled for the instruction of such a person, and permitted the sad example of this undeserving girl to remain before the scholars.† For this serious remissness on his part I am sure the Commissioners will modify the punishment, as the inspector is his own accuser; the attempt to connect me with the case or its results fails.

If this course be persisted in of sending papers to me for remark, that on the face of them furnish any reply necessary, I must suspend my ordinary duties, or at least lose much of the time that should be lawfully devoted to them. I think Mary Murray's case and this are sufficient of Mr. Fleming for some time.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh*,
Head Inspector.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

* This unofficial habit accords with my Report regarding the manner in which he sent me the returns, &c. of the men's written examination for 1856.

† If Mr. Fleming had stated these facts, as he now states them, in the proper place upon the docket, I would have noted the girl for removal, and I now recommend her immediate removal upon his present report.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 1 August 1857.

I REQUEST you will attach this letter and the six documents forwarded herewith to my communication of the 28th ult., in reference to the case of the monitorship in Ballinacarrig National School, district 35.

In Mr. Fleming's letter upon this subject, dated May 9th, he repeatedly inveighs against my inconsistency in recommending that the manager of the Rathdrum and other National Schools should be presented with a set of books, and a complimentary letter by the Commissioners on the grounds of his zeal in the promotion of education and the general excellence of his schools, whilst some few months after so doing I stated that "one (of the ten schools) was not conducted in a manner suited to the training of a monitor." He says that "official praise and censure thus hastily awarded must eventually become valueless in the estimation of school managers, who cannot be supposed to attach any weight to opinions formed upon insufficient grounds, and contradictory in their nature."

The documents forwarded herewith, which only now turned up in putting by some of my correspondence, were all written about the time I made that recommendation, and they are therefore of the most reliable character.

No. 1. Mr. Fleming's note requesting a loan of his District Book, then and for some time in my possession. I had examined Rathdrum male school for two days (September 2d and 3d), and had visited the female school. Mr. Galvin was present for hours during one of the days; and from this interview, the high efficiency of the schools, and the reports which I had heard of the other schools of the parish, I examined with interest Mr. Fleming's reports upon them all in the District Book.

2. Mr. O'Neill's letter (8/10/56), giving names of some of his pupils, and an account of the working of his school.

3. Mr. O'Neill's letter (18/10/56), written by direction of Mr. Fleming, urging the claims of his school, and the schools of the parish, for aid to introduce vocal music into the vicinity. This letter very correctly expresses the claims of Rev. Mr. Galvin in relation to his schools.

4. Letter from Rev. Mr. Galvin (16/10/56) on same subject, and in proof of same aims.

5. Rev. Mr. Grant's note (29/10/56) as to the high character of Miss Reynolds, in Wicklow National School, where she had removed in the previous month from Rev. Mr. Galvin's female school, Rathdrum. (See page 7 of my letter.)

6. Mr. Fleming's own summary report on Ballinacarrig National School, from which you will see that long previous to this controversy the teacher, John Byrne, was summoned to the written examination of 1856, for unsatisfactory answering at previous examination (sect. III. head 4 of general regulations); that he describes his "Method of teaching" as "Middling;" extent of instruction imparted, "Middling;" and reports on school for previous year as "Not very favourable." Average attendance, 56; or 36 boys and 20 girls. This report was written late in September 1856.

There are some other documents which, if I find, they will further expose the character of Mr. Fleming, in putting forward such a production as his letter of May 9th.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh,*
Head Inspector.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

(No. 1.)

Memorandum at top of this note in the handwriting of Mr. Kavanagh: "This note was written, I think, on Saturday, 13th September, and the District Book had been in my hands from the previous week.—*J. W. K.*—1/8/57."

Dear Sir,

You will be good enough to let bearer have my District Book, as I cannot draw up my reports without it. I shall only require it for a short time (say for to-day), after which you may have it for the rest of the week, if necessary.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *J. G. Fleming.*

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

(No. 2.)

Memorandum by Mr. Kavanagh: "No. 2, with my Letter, 1/8/57.—*J. W. K.*"

Rathdrum National School,
8 October 1856.

Sir,

In compliance with your request, I beg to submit for your information the names, &c. of the boys who were educated in my school for the profession of teacher:

1st. Terence O'Neill, who acted as monitor for nearly two years in this school (from the 1st November 1852 till the 1st August 1854); was then trained in the junior special class; and afterwards, in June 1855, appointed teacher of Claravale National School; Roll, No. 7,250.

2d. James Shulock, who succeeded T. O'Neill in the monitorship, and afterwards went to Clonmel Model School as pupil teacher.

3d. Peter Murtagh, the present monitor, and successor to J. Shulock; and James Murphy (if I may include him), who is at present preparing, by your directions, to become pupil teacher in a model school.

It may be asked (and very naturally too) why I have not, during my long service under the Board (now 10 years), trained more boys for the teaching profession than those abovementioned. My answer is, that the boys who have hitherto, with few exceptions, constituted the advanced classes in my school, were the sons of persons of rather respectable circumstances in life, who would prefer any other pursuit for their children before that of teacher.

The following are the names, taken from the register, of a few of the class of boys here referred to:—

Name.	Rel. Den.	Observations.
Samuel Manning	E. C.	Son of Dr. Manning, this town; now at school in Dublin.
Francis Manning	E. C.	Corballis Castle; now emigrated.
Edmond Manning	E. C.	
John Manning	E. C.	
Simon Moran	R. C.	Brother of Bishop Moran, late of Haddington-road, Dublin.
Charles Byrne	R. C.	Now St. Lawrence School, Dublin; brother of the late Rev. Mr. Byrne, C. C., Castledermot.
Augustine Cowly	R. C.	Son of Mr. Cowly, of this town, shopkeeper and van proprietor.
Johnston Moreton	E. C.	Son of the late hotel-keeper of Rathdrum; now at business in Brown & Thomas's, Dublin.

Perhaps it may not be wrong to state, although it may appear somewhat irrelevant to the matter in question, that I met with great opposition from many parties immediately after the opening of this school; from persons who were averse to our system in consequence of its principles; and from others, because it was intended to supersede in this locality the entire services in future of the hedge teachers. But I perseveringly continued to remove these obstacles to my success, till I eventually obtained a character here for myself, as well as a permanent basis for the system I so strenuously advocated, by the close attention I always paid to the duties of its office.

As I feel somewhat reluctant to make further observation relative to any particular class of persons, or to the difficulties I had to overcome in conscientiously and effectually fulfilling the duties of my situation as teacher, I shall pass over in silence many little incidents in the history of this school, and conclude by merely adding that I have now altogether gained the confidence of all classes of persons as to the education of their children, and particularly of those who at first set an example of the greatest opposition to my success; and further, I have shown, by the effectiveness of the instruction imparted in my school, that I am now and henceforth deserving of both their encouragement and support.

Hoping you will pardon me for this very long letter,

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.,
Head Inspector, National Schools.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James D. O'Neill.*

(No. 3.)

With Mr. *Kavanagh's* Letter of the 1/8/57.

Sir, Rathdrum, 18 October 1856.

HAVING heard that a singing master is to be sent by the Board to give instructions in the Wicklow and Arklow National Schools, and knowing the anxiety of the Rev. Mr. Galvin, our patron, to obtain, if possible, a similar favour for the schools of his parish, but more especially for those of this town, I beg most respectfully to lay before you, for your consideration, by direction of Mr. Fleming, the grounds on which we rest our hope for a participation in the above-mentioned favour.

Feeling it unnecessary to dwell here on the civilising effects which a knowledge of vocal music produces, or to speak of the great assistance it affords in general to a polished and refined education, so essential at least for the respectable class of females attending our National Schools, I shall therefore, and without further comment on the value of an accomplishment so well known to all, come to the matter in question.

The first point I wish to draw attention to, then, is the great number of both teachers and children of this locality that could avail themselves of such singing master's instruction, should he make Rathdrum his central place of residence; and the second point is, the ready and cheap mode of conveyance that exists between this and the neighbouring towns.

This parish contains nine National Schools (excluding those of the workhouse), all under the management of the Rev. Mr. Galvin, and they have a gross attendance, I should say, of not less than 750 children. The Rathdrum schools, in point of position, are in the centre, and command a daily attendance at present of 130 children, which is not likely to decrease much, if any, for the ensuing year. From all these schools then, the teachers, and in most cases the majority of the children, would attend such instructor at the time and place appointed; nor would the numbers be confined to this parish alone, since there are schools in some of the adjoining parishes not more than four miles from this town, whose teachers, I am confident, would gladly avail themselves of any opportunity to qualify themselves in that way.

Taking Rathdrum, then, as the radiating point, as it is "head quarters" of the inspector, the teachers of the following schools, with the principal children thereat, would attend here at the times appointed:—

Rathdrum, male and female.					
Claravale.—Distance from Rathdrum	-	-	-	2	miles.
Ballinacarrig	„	„	- - -	2	„
Trooperstown	„	„	- - -	4	„
Kilcashel	„	„	- - -	2½	„

And the teachers alone from the following schools:—

Glenmalur.—Distant from Rathdrum	-	-	-	6	miles.
St. Kevin's	„	„	- - -	7	„
Macreddin	„	„	- - -	6	„
Newbridge	„	„	- - -	5	„
Banardarrig	„	„	- - -	5	„

It will be easily seen from the above that there is ample scope for the labours of a singing master in this locality; and as far as material is concerned, in reference to the children here, I believe them to be not inferior to those of either Wicklow or Arklow in the qualities necessary to turn such instruction to the best possible account.

As to the rate of conveyance by public vehicles or cars between this town and Wicklow, it is exceedingly moderate. I believe it is at present as low as 6*d.*, and the rate to Arklow is equally trifling. Without dwelling longer on this point, which can offer no obstacle to the attainment of the matter in question, I beg to say that the advantages conferred on this locality in an educational point of view, by your conceding to our request, would be incalculable, inasmuch as all the above-mentioned teachers would thenceforth introduce the system of vocal music into their schools, and thereby instruct others who in time

time might become teachers also, and so increase, in one hundred fold proportion, the value of the original instruction given.

Feeling no confidence whatever in any statement from myself being effective in the present case, I may therefore be allowed again to repeat that such is the desire of the Rev. Mr. Galvin to have his schools in point of instruction second to none of similar circumstance under the Board, and knowing, as I have stated, how sanguine he feels about the present matter, his disappointment will be therefore great indeed should he not receive for his schools (for these at least) the same privilege about to be granted to those of Wicklow and Arklow. In conclusion I shall only add, that as I have hitherto endeavoured to the best of my abilities to advance the interests of national education in this locality, I shall not be wanting in the present instance (if I get the opportunity of doing so) to co-operate in the extension of this most desirable acquisition and useful appendage to a liberal education.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James D. O'Neill.*

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.,
Head Inspector, National Schools.

(No. 4.)

With Mr. *Kavanagh's* Letter, 1/8/57.

Dear Mr. Kavanagh, Rathdrum, 18 October 1856.

HAVING heard that a singing master is to be sent by the National Board to the Wicklow and Arklow National Schools, I take the liberty of urging our claim to get him here. Also I would go so far as as to suggest that this place, being central, might be made his head quarters.

There are public conveyances from Wicklow Railway to this town twice a day; fare, 6*d.* We have nine or ten National Schools in the parish; and our male teacher, Mr. O'Neill, has deserved well of the Board by the very superior style in which he carries out the system. He has been a model for the teachers all round.

We are all determined, as far as we are able, to promote the interests of national education, and not to let any of the neighbouring parishes take the lead of us. Feeling the very great importance of singing with regard to its civilising influence, and confident that we will be able to realise a large singing class, I hope you will kindly urge our claim on the National Board.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *Richard Galvin.*

(No. 5.)

Enclosed in Mr. *Kavanagh's* Letter of the 1/8/57.

Dear Sir, Wicklow, 29 October 1856.

I SUPPOSE you are aware that our male school here is now without a teacher this some time past. You were kind enough to promise me that you would procure a proper teacher for it, as soon as Mr. Noughter would resign it. He is now gone, and the school is in a bad way without him; as bad as he was, it was much better to have him, than to have no teacher. Pray let me know what chance I may have to get one to take the charge of it. If I get a teacher equally clever, and as anxious as Miss Reynolds is to promote the interest and character of the school there, I am persuaded our schools will take a high stand; for Miss Reynolds is doing wonders in her school.

My dear sir, I hope you will be able to procure a proper teacher as soon as possible.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *J. Grant*, P. P.
(Wicklow.)

J. J. Kavanagh, Esq.

(No. 6.)

CHARACTER SHEET.—District 35.

COUNTY.	Roll Number.	SCHOOL.	Teacher's Name.	Class and Division.	Age of Teacher.	When appointed under Board.	When Trained.	Under what Head of General Regulations summoned.	General Observance of Rules of Board.
Wicklow - -	3551	Ballinacarrig -	John Byrne - -	1[3]	45	9.44	1845	4th	Fair - -

Method of Teaching.	Extent of Instruction imparted, or Branches taught.	State of School as regards			Cleanliness			State of School Accounts.		Average for the Year.	Have the Reports for the last Year been Favourable, or not?
		Discipline and Order.	Proficiency of Junior Classes.	Proficiency ot Senior Classes.	Of School Room.	Of School Premises.	Of Children.	As to Accuracy.	As to Neatness.		
Middling -	Middling -	B.	B.	C.	A.	A.	B.	B.	B.	M. 36 / 20	Not very favourable.

Gentlemen, Wicklow, 10 August 1858.

I BEG to return herewith the accompanying documents,* forwarded to me with your letter of 31st ultimo, in reference to Mr. Kavanagh's communication of 28th July 1857. They call for no remark from me, as they do not, in the slightest degree, affect the main question at issue between us.

Mr. Kavanagh writes to the Commissioners, stating that the Ballinacarrig National School is unsuited for training a paid monitor. The manager's letter of appeal, requesting a reconsideration of the case, is referred to me. I report favourably upon it, adding that I and my predecessors always regarded that school as adapted for training a paid monitor; expressing my surprise Mr. Kavanagh should think otherwise, as he had but a short time ago requested the Secretaries to forward Rev. Mr. Galvin a complimentary letter, and a complete set of the Board's books, for the general efficiency of the schools under his management (Ballinacarrig being one of them). I further mentioned that Mr. Kavanagh had never entered five of the eight schools which he reported as efficient.

What connexion, I ask, have the documents (now referred to) with the case? None whatever. 1. Rev. Mr. Galvin speaks in very favourable terms of Mr. O'Neill, teacher of the Rathdrum National School, and requests the services of a singing master for the schools in his parish. 2. Letter from Rathdrum male teacher, enclosing the names of some boys educated in his school for the profession of teaching, with a brief sketch of the history of his school. 3. Letter from same party, urging the claims of the schools under Rev. Mr. Galvin's management, to the services of a singing master. 4. Note from Rev. Mr. Grant, of Wicklow, referring in highly favourable terms to the success and efficiency of a Miss Reynolds, who had been previously teacher of the Rathdrum Girls'

* *See* List of documents given at end of this letter.

Girls' National School. 5. A note of mine requesting Mr. Kavanagh to let me have the District Book. 6. Summary of my report on the Ballinacarrig National School.

The first five of these documents are entirely irrelevant to the subject-matter under discussion, and as regards the questions in dispute between Mr. Kavanagh and me, they mean nothing, and are nothing. The only probable reason I can surmise for their production, is, that he hoped, by heaping around the original case, which was in itself a very simple one, a mass of wholly irrelevant matter, to succeed in diverting attention from the real points at issue. I always spoke of the Rathdrum Boys' National School and of its teacher, in terms of high commendation. I have only to add, that in no report of mine is there any statement to warrant the assumption that I ever regarded the Ballinacarrig National School as unsuited for training a monitor.

I beg, &c.
(signed) *J. G. Fleming*,
District Inspector.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

DOCUMENTS RETURNED.

1. Letter from Mr. Kavanagh to Secretaries, dated 1 August 1857.
2. Letter from Rev. R. Galvin to Mr. Kavanagh, dated 16 October 1856.
3. Letter from James D. O'Neill to Mr. Kavanagh, dated 8 October 1856.
4. Letter from James D. O'Neill to Mr. Kavanagh, dated 18 October 1856.
5. Letter from Rev. J. Grant to Mr. Kavanagh, dated 29 October 1856.
6. Letter from Mr. Fleming to Mr. Kavanagh (no date).

Gentlemen, Wicklow, 12 August 1858.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 31st ultimo, enclosing a communication from Mr. Kavanagh, dated 28th July 1857, in explanation of his statement that the Ballinacarrig National School was unsuited for the training of a paid monitor. I now forward, agreeably to your instructions, the following remarks in reply to his letter of the above-mentioned date.

After a careful perusal of Mr. Kavanagh's letter, I find nothing in it to weaken, or in any way invalidate, the clear statement which I made in reference to this case in my communication of the 9th May 1857. He indulges, it is true, in strong personalities and aimless invective, which I shall not notice. I cannot, however, permit his numerous misstatements and exaggerations to remain unanswered. After making a few preliminary observations which call for no reply, he begins by saying, "Dowdall, the monitor, was examined by me, and Mr. Fleming and the teacher both interposed to prevent me from recommending his immediate removal, praying that he might get a last trial." The teacher and I had but one opinion regarding Dowdall's abilities; we thought it a hopeless task to qualify him for the profession of teaching, for which reason I requested Mr. Kavanagh to recommend his immediate removal. He declined doing so, in consequence of the approaching examination of paid monitors, when an opportunity would offer of dismissing Dowdall, in the event of his still remaining ignorant and unqualified. The teacher never interfered in the matter, one way or the other.

Mr. Kavanagh adds (same page, letter 28th July 1857), "In the four inspections of the school made by Mr. Fleming previous to our visit in September last, there is no record in the Observation Book warning both teacher and monitor of the great deficiency of the latter. Although the school is in the parish, and within three miles of the inspector's official residence, six months after the supposed distribution of the new observation books it was not then supplied with a copy, nor was the copy found at previous visit filled. The irregularities of this kind which I found, arose altogether from the itinerant squatting, for I can call it by no better name, of the inspector between his three centres, Greystones, Rathdrum, and Kiltegan. He kept neither house, lodgings, conveyance, office; not even a depôt, nor fixed place for managers or

teachers to call on him; but in oriental fashion struck his tent in one locality, minimised his personal and official baggage, and removed to another place in the district. This I mentioned last year to one of the secretaries, and some two months since, to the Resident Commissioner.

I examined the monitor, Dowdall, in October 1855, and found him so deficient that he was specially cautioned for bad answering. The admonition was forwarded to the manager, Rev. Mr. Galvin, who lost no time in communicating its substance to the teacher, Mr. J. Byrne, and to the monitor himself. I subsequently recorded in the Paid Monitors' Register, that Dowdall was extremely ignorant and should be dismissed, if not better qualified at next examination. This was quite enough for every useful purpose, and nothing more is, I believe, ever done in similar cases by my brother inspectors. In fact, the Commissioners do not require the District Inspector to record the results of the paid monitors' examinations in the observation books of the schools. This Mr. Kavanagh knows perfectly well, and he departs from the real point at issue between us, when he introduces the question of what I did or did not write in the observation books.

The written statements, appended to my letter of 3d instant, of all the head inspectors with whom I did duty previous and subsequent to my official intercourse with Mr. Kavanagh, render it unnecessary for me to notice at any length the latter's remarks regarding my mode of life. I have always endeavoured to conduct myself as became my position, and his statements to the contrary are utterly without foundation. Having one of the most extensive districts in Ireland under my charge, I was necessarily from home for several days, and occasionally for some weeks together. But this was a matter of necessity, not of choice; and my predecessors were obliged to do the very same thing. This can be easily conceived when I state that the Wicklow district is extremely mountainous, that nearly all the schools are at considerable distances from my official centre, and that they are scattered over an area of 823 square miles. Assuming, however, that my mode of life was really what Mr. Kavanagh now states it to have been, the question naturally suggests itself: Why is it that he never spoke to me on so essential a point of duty? In his letter of 10th April 1857 he covers some four pages of paper in showing that, till the 30th January, the very last day we met, his relations, social and official, with me were of the most friendly character, and he sums up in the following words: "During the month (September) that we were in Greystones he visited schools with me, he coming on my car whenever available; and not merely were our official relations, but our social and private intercourse was of the most friendly character" (the words are underlined in Mr. Kavanagh's letter). "I left Greystones 3d October, but returned there the 29th, at the request of Mr. Fleming, whose guest I was for the three days that I remained inspecting schools, &c. with him * * * The same feeling continued between Mr. Fleming and me up to the very last moment of our intercourse." Is this very friendly feeling consistent with his entire silence as to my mode of travelling through the district? But apart from all considerations of friendship, he was bound by the strict letter of his duty to report for the information of the Commissioners any act of mine in the least derogatory to the respectable position in which I had been placed. He never did anything of the kind; I can produce the originals of all his letters to me. I have seen all his reports on schools under my superintendence; I have read every line of his official correspondence regarding me up to the 29th May 1857; and in none of these documents does he make the slightest reference, or drop even the most remote hint, that could be interpreted as indicative of the opinion which he now expresses in his letter of 28th May 1857, long after all official intercourse between us had ceased. But dismissing, for a moment, this common-sense view of the question, what, I ask, is to be thought of the man who with professions of friendship on his lips, and holding with me, as he himself asserts, not only official, but social and private intercourse of the most friendly nature, remains before me all the while silent upon a subject intimately affecting my honour and character, and then, on the eve of our official separation, but without the slightest or most distant allusion dropped to me of his views or intentions, avails himself of the opportunity given him by his position privately to whisper his inuendoes against me in the ears of the Secretary and Resident Commissioner, and, so far as in his power, try to damage me in their estimation? But Mr. Kavanagh is not ashamed to admit that he acted towards me as I have just described, for he states (page 3, letter 29/7/57): "This,"

my

my supposed mode of life, "I mentioned last year to one of the Secretaries, and some two months since to the resident Commissioner," during which time our official and social relations were of the most friendly character. Every honourable man, even the rudest minds, acting from the common instinct of justice and fair play, can entertain but one opinion of Mr. Kavanagh's conduct in this matter. I now sum up this part of the case thus: either Mr. Kavanagh had substantial grounds for stating that whilst under his direct official control, in 1855, 1856, and up till 29 May 1857, my mode of life, "itinerant squatting," was derogatory to my position, and seriously interfered with the correct discharge of my duty, or he did not hold such an opinion. Assuming the first supposition to be true, then he was false and disloyal to me in his capacity of private friend, in never giving me the slightest hint of the very low estimate he entertained of my conduct and mode of life, and he was still more unfaithful towards the Commissioners in making no official report on a subject so momentous to the well-being of the service, in which he held so responsible a position. But if during our long intercourse he had no reason for expressing (and certain it is he never did express officially or otherwise to me) the very unfavourable opinion of my habits of life, now set forth in such strong language in his letter of 29th May 1857, it is plain Mr. Kavanagh has improvised a serious charge against his subordinate in office to suit a discreditable purpose.

Mr. Kavanagh refers (page 4 of his letter 29/8/57), to the grounds upon which he founded his opinion that the Ballinacarrig National School is not suited for training a monitor: 1. Present teaching staff ample; 2. The school is conducted rather as two separate schools under two teachers than as one mixed school under one teacher; 3. Master's manner and temper; 4. His method of teaching and examining a class; 5. The monitor failed in two years to be made anything of. In the first place, the attendance at Ballinacarrig National School is considerable during the greater part of the year. I have frequently seen 80, 90, and even 100 children present. The attendance continues very large all through the summer, and even during the winter months it slightly exceeds 40. Now, even assuming the annual average attendance at the winter minimum of 40, the school would, by the rules of the Board, be entitled to the services of a paid monitor, and of course much more so when we find that on Mr. Kavanagh's own showing the annual average reaches 55. The teacher's wife attends only for two hours daily, and for the express purpose of conducting an industrial or sewing class, for which alone she is paid by the Board. That duty is too important to be neglected, which it must be if she devote any portion of her two hours to the literary business of the school, supposing her capable of doing so, which she is not. Therefore, the teaching staff, as Mr. Kavanagh calls it, is not ample. The staff comprises but one person, the male teacher, who cannot conduct the business of his large school in a satisfactory manner, without the aid of an assistant or paid monitor. There is, in short, but one literary teacher, and but one room in the Ballinacarrig National School. This is a sufficient reply to Mr. Kavanagh's remarks, that it is conducted rather as two separate schools under two teachers. Finally, he pays a hurried visit of some two hours to a large school, numbering 82 pupils, which he finds in charge of a very nervous and timid man, unaccustomed to see strangers, and more or less awed by the unexpected visit of a head inspector. Without seeing anything more of either school or teacher, he comes to the conclusion that it is not suited for the training of a monitor. I again repeat, that it was impossible for him to form anything like an adequate opinion of the school or teacher from a short visit of some two hours, a considerable part of which was consumed in examining paid monitor Dowdall, and in scrutinizing inspection of the school accounts, observation books, &c. The monitor's failure in his studies arose from his want of natural abilities, and could in no way be attributed to the teacher's neglect. The lad was kept on trial for two years in the hope of his ultimate improvement, and for the additional reason, that it was impossible to find any better qualified person to take his place.

I have now briefly referred to the grounds which Mr. Kavanagh states influenced him in representing the Ballinacarrig National School as not suited for the training of a paid monitor; and for the purpose of giving the Commissioners the fullest information on the case, I have gone to the trouble of exposing their fallaciousness. But a far more serious question here arises: was Mr. Kavanagh led solely by what he saw of that school in deciding it was not suited for training a monitor? Or were the reasons he now alleges as

influencing him in his decision a mere afterthought, brought forward to support an untenable position? The following evidence will, I believe, go far to establish the latter assumption:—1. Mr. Kavanagh, in his report of 23d September 1856 on the Ballinacarrig School, makes no allusion whatever to the teacher's want of qualification for training a monitor. 2. He did not remove the monitor for a considerable time after his inspection of the school; on the contrary, he sanctioned his being continued for further trial, a course which does not seem consistent with his subsequent statement, that the school was unsuited for training a monitor. 3. When he had ascertained that the boy Dowdall was likely to be removed from the situation of paid monitor, he pointed out in mine and the teacher's presence a young lad named Radcliffe, one of the pupils present, as a proper substitute for Dowdall, who it was understood would most probably be removed after his next examination. The teacher, Mr. Byrne, has often referred to this circumstance to show that Mr. Kavanagh did not really believe his school unsuited for training a paid monitor. The following is the teacher's account of what occurred:—"On the day Mr. Kavanagh visited my school, 23d September 1856, when making some objections to the capabilities of my paid monitor (Denis Dowdall), he at the same time pointed to a boy in the fourth class, named J. Radcliffe, who he thought would be a suitable person to succeed Dowdall in my school in case that he (Dowdall) did not acquit himself satisfactorily at the coming examination of paid monitors. You may recollect this fact yourself, as I think you were standing near at the time. Mr. Kavanagh certainly left the impression on my mind that in case of Dowdall's being dismissed that I could immediately have another boy appointed in his place, on account, as I before remarked, of his pointing to the boy. * * * * * I am prepared, if called on in a lawful manner, to make an affirmation before a magistrate to the truth of what I state in this note relative to Mr. Kavanagh." If required, I am prepared to do the same; and now I leave Mr. Kavanagh to make any assertions he pleases.

Mr. Kavanagh enters into the most minute details to show that he was perfectly warranted in recommending that a set of books and a complimentary letter should be sent to the Reverend Mr. Galvin for the general efficiency of the schools under his management. The question, relieved of the multitude of words by which he has obscured it, is simply this—"Is an inspector justified in reporting five schools as efficient which he never saw?" Mr. Kavanagh answers in the affirmative, and in the following words, page 10, letter 28/7/57: "Mr. Fleming does not, I hope, correctly estimate his own veracity and judgment, when he so ignores his testimony, both oral and that recorded in his official books, as to state that I was unable to know from my own observation whether some of the schools were thatched or slated, in good or bad repair, &c.; in short, for all practical purposes, that I was no more in a position to form an opinion from my own inspection of five of the schools, than if they had been in Canada or Australia, and under the superintendence of Mr. Robertson or Mr. Davitt. There might be point and pertinency," adds Mr. Kavanagh, "in this nonsensical flourish, if I had ever stated directly or by implication, that I had any knowledge of the five schools referred to as derived from my own inspection of them; or if that knowledge entered into or was a necessary element to warrant me in the recommendation made * * * * and even had I no evidence beyond reliable report, I would vote a set of books to a manager on evidence upon which we vote tens of thousands of pounds in salaries to teachers of whose schools the head inspectors have no knowledge from personal inspection." This is mere hairsplitting. Undoubtedly the Commissioners pay salaries to teachers of whose schools neither they nor the head inspectors have any knowledge from personal inspection, but the Commissioners obtain the required information from the district inspector, who is always supposed to have it from a personal inspection of the schools. In the same way, when a head inspector takes the very unusual step of recommending that a complimentary letter and a complete set of the Board's books be forwarded to a gentleman for the efficient state of all the schools under his management, it is also presumed that he derives his information from a personal inspection of those schools. If not, his office is unprofitable and useless. The Commissioners cannot have a personal knowledge of the teachers to whom they award salaries, but it is precisely on that account they require the inspector's services. He is supposed to be the source from which they derive their official information; but if he reports schools as efficient which he never saw, then I say his services are valueless and his office

office without meaning. Mr. Kavanagh, however, pleads that he had my oral and written testimony to guide him in the matter. To which I have merely to reply, that he never in any way, either by writing or in conversation, asked my opinion on the matter; and nothing I ever said to him could at all lead me to think that he was about making the recommendation already referred to. In almost every instance, so far, where our statements are at variance upon the same points, I have been fortunate enough to hold documentary evidence of such a nature as relieved me from the trouble of dwelling at any length in my explanation of his statements. I am to some extent equally fortunate in this instance. He appeals to my written testimony in the district book, in which, he says, he made a minute examination of the abstract of my reports upon the five schools (under Reverend Mr. Galvin's management), which he admits he never visited. It is only right to refer to my entries in the district book respecting those schools, and which I forward herewith for the information of the Board: Macreddin (male), Macreddin (female), Claravale, Glenmalure, and Mucklow, are the names of the five schools referred to. It is, of course, unnecessary for me to return any entry in the district book subsequent to the date of Mr. Kavanagh's letter of recommendation in reference to the Reverend Mr. Galvin's schools.

NAME of SCHOOL.	Inspector's Opinion of Teacher, &c.	Date of Visits.	State of School.	School Accounts.	Supply of Books.
Macreddin (male)	Deficient in method; careless as regards neatness and cleanliness of school-room. In 1st division of 3d class.	12 July - 1855	Can form no adequate opinion, being my first visit.	Middling - -	A supply required.
Slated house; flooring boarded; no clock nor black board. School struck off roll, for insufficient average attendance, 5 October 1855; restored 27 June 1856.					
Macreddin (female.)	Attentive and painstaking; very small attendance, not likely to increase to any great extent. Teacher in 1st division of 3d class.	26 October 1855 28 Feb. - 1856 8 May - 1856	First inspection - Improved - - Stationary - -	Not neatly kept ditto - - Register badly kept.	Adequate. ditto. Insufficient.
No clock nor black board; room slated; flooring boarded.					
Mucklow - -	Middling, both as regards method and acquirements. (Subsequently recommended for dismissal by Head Inspector, Dr. Newell.) Teacher, a probationer.	8 May - 1855 23 Nov. - 1855 14 April - 1856 19 August 1856	First inspection - Closed. Middling - - Stationary - -	Middling - - Tolerable - - Fair - - -	Tolerable. Adequate. ditto.
Small thatched house; earthen floor; no clock; but one large map in the school.					
Claravale - -	Deficient in method; wants energy; school in a backward state. I cannot report more favourably of it after second visit. Teacher in 2d division of 3d class.	5 October 1855 20 Feb. - 1856 9 May - 1856	Can hardly form an opinion, being my first visit. Closed; teacher very ill. No improvement -	Middling - - Tolerable - -	Inadequate. Adequate.
A very bad school-house; thatched; earthen flooring, used temporarily till manager procures a more suitable building.					
Glenmalure -	Acquirements and method only moderate. Attentive.	23 May - 1855 6 Dec. - 1855 2 April - 1856 13 June 1856	Cannot form an opinion, being my first visit. Closed. Closed, owing to the extreme severity of the weather. Improved - -	Middling - - Tolerable - -	Inadequate. Adequate.
School-house (narrow and contracted in dimensions) in a very dilapidated state.					

It rests with the Commissioners to decide whether the foregoing abstracts of my reports, taken from the district book, on the above-mentioned schools, afforded Mr. Kavanagh any reasonable grounds for making a general statement regarding their efficiency, &c. In his letter of 28 July 1857 he speaks of all the national schools in Rev. Mr. Galvin's parish. I cannot conceive why he does so: his letter of recommendation has reference only to the schools under that gentleman's own management. But when called upon to explain (if so disposed) why it was he reported as to the efficiency of five schools which he never saw, he simply admits that such was the case, and then follows his strange explanation. "I did not," he says, "form any opinion respecting those five schools from my own personal inspection of them, but, in addition to the three schools under Rev. Mr. Galvin's management, and which I did inspect, I also visited two schools, Rathdrum Poor Law Union, and Trooperstown, both in his parish." What have they to do with the case? Are they under that gentleman's management or control? Not at all. But, says Mr. Kavanagh, Trooperstown School is under Rev. Mr. Galvin's moral management. The reverend gentleman's note is now before me, in which he distinctly states, "It is not true that I ever had the moral management of the Trooperstown School," neither has he anything to do with the arrangements and control of the Rathdrum Poor Law Union Schools, which, as everybody knows, are under the direct and exclusive management of the Poor Law Guardians. I now beg to conclude this part of the case with the following brief summary of facts: 1. Mr. Kavanagh never examined a single child in the Rathdrum Poor Law Union Girls' School: he merely walked with me into the girls' room, looked about him for a minute or two, glanced his eye over a few of the children's copy-books, and then left. 2. He never even entered the Rathdrum Boys' Poor Law Union National School. 3. He never examined a single child in the Trooperstown National School on the occasion of his first visit (16 September 1856), for the simple reason that he only arrived at the school at 3½ p.m., or half an hour after the pupils had left; consequently there could be no examination. This is stated in the report of his first visit to the Trooperstown National School, although he sedulously conceals the fact in his letter of explanation of 28 July 1857. His subsequent visit to that school, when he did examine the children, occurred on the 29th October 1856, long after he had recommended that a complimentary letter and a set of books should be forwarded to the Rev. Mr. Galvin. Moreover, he never examined the teachers of those schools during his transient visits, extending to a few minutes in one case, and from 3½ till 4½ in another. 4. He consequently knew nothing whatever of the literary qualifications of the teachers, or of the proficiency and answering of their pupils in either of the schools, Rathdrum Poor Law Union or Trooperstown, when he wrote the recommendation referred to, although he names them as two of the five schools whose satisfactory condition influenced him when making that recommendation. 5. Hence, of the 11 National Schools * in Rev. Mr. Galvin's parish, not less than six were never even entered by him; to two of them he paid a mere flying visit, without examining either the teachers or their pupils; and of the remaining three which he did regularly inspect, he condemns one as wanting in a most essential element of school management; and of a second his report is by no means favourable, thus leaving him a personal and favourable knowledge of but one school as the basis on which to forward his recommendation as to Rev. Mr. Galvin. And now, I would ask, is Mr. Kavanagh justified in asserting that when making that recommendation he acted from "a fulness of knowledge"? In concluding, I feel bound to convey, through you, gentlemen, to the Commissioners, my warmest thanks for their kind consideration in granting me an opportunity of replying to charges which, had they appeared uncontradicted, must have injuriously affected my character as a gentleman and as an officer of the Board.

I beg, &c.

(signed) *J. G. Fleming*,
District Inspector (40).

The Secretaries, Education Office.

---

* Ballinacarrig, Rathdrum (male), Rathdrum (female), Rathdrum Poor Law Union (female), Rathdrum Poor Law Union (male), Macreddin (male), Macreddin (female), Mucklow, Glenmalure, Claravale, and Trooperstown.

Ballinacarrig National Schools,
Sir, 11 August 1858.

In compliance with your request, I beg leave to remind you that on the day of Mr. Kavanagh's visit to my school on the 23d September 1856, when making some objections to the capabilities of my paid monitor (Denis Dowdall), he at the same time pointed to a boy in the fourth class, named J. Radcliffe, who he thought would be a suitable person to succeed Dowdall in my school, in case that he (Dowdall) did not acquit himself satisfactorily at the coming examination of paid monitors. You may recollect the fact yourself, as I think you were standing near at the time. Mr. Kavanagh certainly left the impression on my mind that in case of Dowdall being dismissed, I could immediately have another boy appointed in his place, on account, as I before remarked, of his pointing to the boy. Now, it appears rather strange to me, that he (Mr. Kavanagh) should be instrumental in depriving so large a school as mine of the advantages of a monitor on the grounds of my school not being conducted in a manner suited for the training of such; or how he could, in a short visit of about two hours, form as correct an opinion of the working of my school as the other inspectors who had a knowledge of me and the school for years, and who were, of course, unanimous in their opinions that my school required a paid monitor, and was conducted in a manner suited for the training of the like. I am prepared, if called on in a lawful manner, to make an affirmation before a magistrate to the truth of what I state in this note relative to Mr. Kavanagh; and I would wish to get a fair trial by having another monitor appointed to my school, as I feel confident that I am well able to train a boy in my school who would give satisfaction in any school to which he might be afterwards appointed as teacher, as a monitor whom I taught in my school conducted Ballycanew National School, and, according to the patron's statement, gave entire satisfaction to all concerned in that establishment.

I am, &c.
(signed) *J. Byrne.*

No. 1. (E.)

Correspondence between the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools), relative to his application to have a Treatise on Arithmetic, compiled by him, placed on the list of books sold by the Commissioners for the use of the National Schools, and also relative to the advertisement, or handbill, respecting the work in question. From the 17th March to the 13th October 1857.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 17 March 1857.

With a view to its being placed on the price list amongst the books approved of and recommended, I beg leave to submit to the Commissioners of National Education the accompanying copy of the 5th edition of my Treatise on Arithmetic.

This edition has been carefully revised, and also enlarged by a considerable amount of new matter upon subjects not treated of in any similar work in use in Ireland. See the articles on Interest, Coins and Coinage, Decimal Coinage, Calculation, Notes on the Use of Decimal Fractions, &c.

There is no work in English on arithmetic which, taken as a whole, contains more of the science, or theory; and in treating of the subject practically, I have used and applied those peculiar advantages which 23 years' experience of your schools and teachers have given me. An examination of the work will show that from the first to the last ample directions are given through it for teaching arithmetic, and it contains more of what I may call the literature of the science than any similar treatise with which I am acquainted.

Some persons might object to increase the number of works, already three, on arithmetic, on the Commissioners' list; but you have two grammars, four geographies, three atlasses, &c. The small book is not an arithmetic, although it is a work on calculation, nor does it profess to be more. Dr. Thomson's treatise is used chiefly in the few north-eastern counties, and owing more to

local circumstances than otherwise, and our teachers desire a work written by a person better acquainted with the peculiar wants and circumstances of the Irish National Schools. It is a good book in the hands of a high order of teachers, who themselves are superior to it; but the low sale of 2,500 copies of it last year, or under five copies to each school, indicates its want of general use. The Board's larger arithmetic sells merely because it is cheap, and on the price list; it could have little sale on its merits, whilst Dr. Thomson's could and has. I refer you to the opinions of any of our officers competent to judge as to the imperfection of your long arithmetic as a school book. Its cheapness, &c., secured for it a sale of 6,700 copies, or about 13 to each school, last year.

I may observe, that there are 17 works on arithmetic, and six on algebra, published by Messrs. Longman & Company, London, on the Price List of the Committee of Council on Education in England.

If approved, the Commissioners may have the arithmetic on the same terms as they get similar works, and I am most anxious to have its price fixed at the lowest profit.

I am, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries, Education Office.

(B. O. 5/6/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 12 June 1857.

Your letter of the 17th March last having been laid before the Board, we are to inform you, that the Commissioners of National Education conceive that the works on arithmetic already supplied by the Board to the national schools are sufficiently good, and that it is not desirable to multiply the number of works on the same subject.

For these and other reasons (which the Commissioners do not think it necessary to specify in detail), they regret they cannot comply with the application made by you to place your arithmetic on the list of the books sanctioned by the Board.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,*
James Kelly, } Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

(B. O. 4/9/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 5 September 1857.

The Commissioners of National Education having had before them the advertisement published by you regarding your arithmetic, we are to inform you that you are to be in attendance at this office on Friday next, the 11th instant, at the hour of one o'clock p. m., in case your presence before the Board may be necessary.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,*
James Kelly, } Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq., Head Inspector.

Gentlemen, Grenville, Rathgar, 12 September 1857.

In reference to the hand-bill advertisement of the publication of a new edition of my arithmetic, and which was the subject of consideration by the Commissioners on yesterday, I deem it right to submit the following statement:

1. When I wrote and printed this, I saw nothing improper or objectionable in its matter or form; as it is quite clear that had I felt or believed that it was open to objection by the Board, I would never have printed thousands of them for circulation amongst the national schools.

2. At least three of the other five head inspectors, unsolicited by me, have written to me, and to others, stating it to be their opinion that the work in question

question is by far the best upon the subject in the language, and, as a matter of modesty, I deemed the short and pithy advertisement adverted to the simplest form of summing up its character.

3. The district inspectors have repeatedly been made the channels for the circulation of various publications (free) by a late member of the Board, many, if not all of them sold to teachers. Professor M'Gauley's Algebra, after it had been refused a place on the Board's Price List, and for the last 19 years several of Professor Sullivan's works, have been on sale in the Training Department, some of them which had never been on the price list, and some which had subsequently been placed thereon. Works also written not by officers of the Board have been on sale in the Training Department.

4. As stated on yesterday, the hand-bill in question has not been circulated or issued beyond 50 copies, which I requested to be sent to Glasnevin; and if these were sent, or were distributed, which I do not know, this is the full and entire extent of its circulation. I have sent no copy to the inspectors, nor, with the exception of one or two friends, have I sent them a copy of the book, and I awaited issuing the notices until I should first communicate with them upon the subject; so far, therefore, there is nothing to be cancelled, nothing to be recalled, in reference to the inspectors, and the error of judgment on the hand-bill is limited in its effects strictly and literally as I have stated.

5. I understand that the hand-bill is disapproved: this I regret, and the matter is merely an error of judgment, founded upon uncensured practices in the Board's service. I shall, as in duty bound, cancel the hand-bills; but as they have not been issued (save as stated), I respectfully submit, that to forward any circular to inspectors or teachers who have never seen or heard of the hand-bill, is not only unnecessary under the circumstances, but, no matter how framed, such circular would have the effect of injuring my property, character and position—a result not to be expected from a mere error of judgment in framing a hand-bill, which has never been circulated, and one which I feel confident is foreign to the desire of the Commissioners in the matter.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh,*
Head Inspector National Schools.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

(B. O. 11/9/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 16 September 1857.

The Commissioners of National Education, having attentively considered the verbal explanation made by you, when called before them at their meeting on the 11th instant, with reference to an advertisement of the fifth edition of your treatise on the "Principles and Practice of Arithmetic," we are directed to inform you that they strongly disapprove of the language used by you in that document. They further consider that it is calculated to lead the public, the national school teachers, pupil teachers, and monitors, to suppose, not only that your work on arithmetic ought to be preferred to those which are published and sanctioned by the Commissioners, but that their head inspectors would act upon this opinion, and that the majority of the district inspectors would serve as your agents in promoting the sale of the book. You admitted in your explanation that you forwarded 50 copies of the advertisement and of your arithmetic to the teachers in training at Glasnevin, and that you printed 3,000 copies of the advertisement, evidently, as the Commissioners conceive, with the object of circulating it more widely.

The Commissioners, therefore, direct us to state that you have acted with gross indiscretion and impropriety in drawing up and issuing the document in question; and we are to add, that they will take this matter into serious consideration when they proceed to decide on your conduct in relation to several other cases in which you are concerned, and which are now before them.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

To J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.
&c. &c. &c.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 17 September 1857.

I BEG leave to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday, conveying the order of the Commissioners, dated the 11th instant, and in which it is stated that they are to "proceed to decide on my conduct in relation to several cases in which I am concerned, and which are now before them."

The order regarding the printed bill about my arithmetic was made without asking me for any explanation respecting it, and on the 12th instant I sent in a statement upon the subject. When called before the Commissioners, I was asked two, and only two, questions: Whether I wrote the bill; and to what extent I have circulated it? and this formed the entire conversation upon the matter.

The paper lately read by me before the British Association is, I presume, one of the cases above referred to, and upon this, also, I have not been called on for any explanation, although it was alluded to, but merely so, by the Board on last Friday, while I was in attendance, and an order was afterwards made to insert the advertisement respecting it in the "Saunders' News-Letter" of the 14th instant.

Again, I am aware that a complaint is pending as to arrear in replying to a few letters and journals within the past year, and in connection with which I am charged with such neglect that I was well nigh causing the failure and total shipwreck of the scheme of organization of the City of Dublin Schools in March last. This latter has not been referred to me for explanation, and, so far from its being well-founded, it was I mainly who saved it from failure and certain shipwreck, and caused it to succeed; and to accuse me of putting the scheme in any peril by my neglect is as unjust as to charge me with the mutiny of the sepoys and the present disasters in India. This matter has not, so far as I know, been brought under the notice of the Board.

I trust that, under these circumstances, the Commissioners will consider that I make only a reasonable request in a matter which appears to be regarded as seriously affecting me, when I ask to have full and timely notice of such intended inquiry, the nature and detail of the several cases to be considered by them, in order that I may submit written explanations upon each, and also that my attendance be required should oral explanation be deemed necessary.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries, Education Office.

Just Published, Price 2*s.*; Free by Post, 2*s.* 4*d.*

ARITHMETIC, ITS PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE.

By James W. Kavanagh, Esq., Head Inspector of National Schools.

This edition (5th) is considerably enlarged, by new and important matter upon coins and coinage, decimal coinage, notation, decimals, and interest.

The work is interspersed with ample directions as to the best mode of teaching the subject, and organizing classes in it. In this respect, it is the only work of the kind which embodies both the entire science of arithmetic, and also the method of treating it as approved by all the head inspectors, and as practised in the Central Training and Model School Departments. Teachers, pupil teachers, and monitors who master its matter, cannot fail in any personal examination on arithmetic to which they may be subjected; and if they adhere to its form and method, they may feel confident, that in this most important branch their classes will be efficiently taught, and favourably reported on by the inspectors.

Published by Marcus and John Sullivan, 27, Marlborough-street, Dublin; or may be had through the Author (Education Office), or through most of the District Inspectors.

Post-office orders the best form of remittance.

(B. O. 18/9/57.)

Sir, Office of Education, 19 September 1857.

IN reply to your letter of the 12th instant, containing certain explanations relative to your advertisement of the publication of a new edition of your arithmetic, we are directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you

you that the letter in question has in no respect caused a change in the opinion formed by them on reading your advertisement. On the contrary, it rather makes them fear that you are incapable of perceiving, even after the gross impropriety of your conduct was pointed out to you, that you had committed a great offence.

The only answer that the Commissioners feel themselves warranted in giving to your present explanation is, that, had such an advertisement been published by any of the officers of the Board to whom you allude, even by one who had never before (as you have often done) incurred its severe censures, they would, without a moment's hesitation, have declared his conduct to have been most indiscreet and most improper, and would have taken into their consideration what adequate punishment ought to be inflicted on the writer.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

Education Office, Training,
22 September 1857.

Gentlemen,

With reference to Mr. Kavanagh's letter of the 12th instant, in which he states, in justification of his advertisement about his arithmetic, that my books were sold in the Training Establishment for the last 19 years, even before they were placed in the sanctioned list, I beg to inform the Board, through you, that the statement has no foundation in fact. I never asked, nor did any person on my behalf ever ask, a teacher or pupil to buy a book of mine. If you refer to an official letter from me, dated 25 November 1844, you will find that my books were originally written to supply a want which I found in the National Schools while acting as inspector from the year 1832 to 1838, and that I offered them to the Board gratuitously. The generosity of the Board prevented them from accepting them unless I would consent to receive the usual terms per sheet which were paid to others. As my books were not compilations, I, fortunately for myself, declined to supply them as such, and this led me to publish them at my own risk and expense. And after they had passed through several editions, and when their success was no longer doubtful, the Board took them from me, as if from a stranger; but with this difference, that my books are at least 30 per cent. cheaper than any of those supplied by the trade to the National Schools.

My books, I need scarcely add, are now supplied by the trade.

With regard to the Papers on Popular Education, there is some foundation for misrepresentation; but by the enclosed circular which was sent to each of the head and district inspectors in 1854, it will be seen that I intended to be a loser to a considerable extent by these publications; and, in fact, I offered a gentleman 50*l.* out of my own pocket, with any profits there might be, to be editor for one year. This he declined to accept, but he offered and gave his assistance gratuitously. By my letter also to Lord Morpeth in 1840 (which is in the same circular) it will be seen that I could not have any pecuniary interest in such a publication. I may now mention, that I have announced openly to the present and last two classes that there were a few hundred copies of the work remaining, and that the publishers would give any person who said he was a national teacher a copy for 1*s.* instead of 1*s.* 6*d.*, the selling price; and on all such occasions I never failed to add, that if it were inconvenient for any teacher to purchase a copy, I would give him an order for one if he called upon me in private. And by a return which I have just received from the publishers, I find that they have, since the 26th May 1856, given to Dr. Sullivan's orders 56 copies.

I am sorry to trouble you with this long letter, but I consider it due to myself and also to the Board to make these explanations.

I am, &c.
(signed) *Robert Sullivan.*

The Secretaries, &c. &c. &c.

(B. O., 25/9/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 26 September 1857.

Your letter of the 17th instant having been laid before the Board, we are directed to inform you, with reference to the following paragraph* which it contains, that the Commissioners of National Education will conduct the inquiry into your conduct in the manner which, in their judgment, will be best calculated to elicit all the facts, and to enable them to arrive at a just decision. If, in the course of the inquiry, they should find it necessary to call for any explanation in addition to what you have already furnished, or to require your attendance, they will give you due notice.

We are, &c.

(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

(Paragraph referred to.)

"I trust that under these circumstances the Commissioners will consider that I make only a reasonable request in a matter which appears to be regarded as seriously affecting me, when I ask to have full and timely notice of such intended inquiry, the nature and detail of the several cases to be considered by them, in order that I may submit written explanations upon each, and also that my attendance be required should oral explanation be deemed necessary."

M. C.
J. K.

(6183—57. B. O., 25/10/57.)

Sir, Office of National Education, 3 October 1857.

We have laid before the Commissioners of National Education your letter of the 22d ultimo, in reference to the allusion made to your books in Mr. Kavanagh's communication of the 12th, and we are now directed to state that the Commissioners consider your explanation quite satisfactory.

We are, &c.

(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

Robert Sullivan, Esq., LL.D.,
Training Department.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 6 October 1857.

In reference to my letter of the 12th ultimo respecting the Handbill advertisement of my work on arithmetic, I beg leave to state that Dr. Sullivan met me in the grounds in Marlborough-street some time since, and informed me that the statements made in my letter, in reference to the sale of his works (not when on the Price List), would oblige him to write to the Commissioners on the subject. He read for me various letters showing the history of his several, or at least his earlier publications, and these he told me he intended to submit to the Commissioners. I am informed that he has written upon the subject, and without intending the slightest disrespect, unkindness, or unfriendliness to Dr. Sullivan, to whom and to whose books I referred, merely in self-defence, I beg leave to submit the following statements:—

I beg leave to submit the Price List of the Commissioners from September 1842, from which it will appear that at that date there were no works by the professors, or by private authors thereon, and also the Price List of April 1843, when works by these parties first appear. I am aware that although not appearing

---

* *See* at close of letter.

appearing on the price list, both "The Outline," by Professor Sullivan, and "Lectures on Natural Philosophy," by Professor M'Gawley, were supplied from November 1840 (date of circular), through the storekeeper, and sold for cash, (at least the latter work) by the superintendents to the national school teachers, and this practice of the superintendents being agents for the cash sale of books by both the professors, ceased only in December 1842. I have before me a letter which rather appears to be a circular from Professor Sullivan, dated

"My dear Sir, "Education Office, 14 April 1842.

"I have at length been enabled to send you (through Mr. Lawrence) copy of my lectures.

"Should you consider it as a work likely to be useful to our schools you will greatly oblige me by doing what you can to assist me in getting it off as soon as possible. Lest you should suppose that I have turned book-maker, and wish to turn my friends into booksellers, I shall state briefly the circumstances connected with each of my publications and leave you to judge:—

"1st. 'The Outline.'† * * *

"3d. The only books for which I require your friendly assistance are the 'Geography,' and the 'Lectures,' and only for the present edition. Should any of the teachers inquire about the other book, you will oblige me by informing them that they must get some person to call on Mr. Lawrence, our bookseller, for them.

I am, &c.

"To ————, Esq. (signed) "*Robert Sullivan.*"

"Superintendent of National Schools."

The next letter, from Professor M'Gawley, written a few months after, shows that the superintendents were not only booksellers, so far as the national schools were concerned, but also that their customers were drawn from a wider field.

"Dear Sir, "Office of Education, 20 July 1842.

"As I am anxious to get out a second edition of the book published by me some time ago, and am informed that some of the copies taken by the Board have been sent to you, I shall feel much obliged if, without any trouble to yourself, you can forward their sale.

"I have no objection that, when you deem it right, they should be given, even at the reduced price, to those who are not national teachers.‡

Very truly yours,

"To ————, Esq. (signed) *James W. M'Gawley.*

"Superintendent of National Schools."

A question arises, was the Board taxed for any of the copies so suggested to be sold to other than national school teachers?

A little book of questions drawn up by Mr. Butler, late Head Inspector, was on sale in the Training Department, by Professor Sullivan, in 1843-44. A good little treatise on algebra, by Mr. Lawler, inspector, was on sale to teachers and pupils by Mr. Larkin, before and during my Head mastership, and with my full permission, in the model school. It was also sold by the inspectors.

Professor M'Gawley's algebra was refused a place in the Price List; he sold it with his own hands to the teachers in training; the inspectors in the country assisted him, and he turned round to the Board, set forth this circulation as an index of its popularity and merit, and the Commissioners, on second application, inserted it on the Price List.

Dr. Sullivan, with his publishers, next door to the Office, does not need to sell any of his works (not on the price list) in the Training Department, but he recommends them there; thus his Papers on Popular Education, and his tracts for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge.

Far be it from me to adduce any of these practices as against any of the parties in question. My object is to put in its true light what has been done towards

† The inspectors were mere local storekeepers for the Board's publications, but they were, in addition, regular booksellers and reviewers for those by the professors.

‡ Contrary to the Board's instructions in circular 28/11/40, section 9, which see.

towards me, when I printed, but scarcely can be said to have circulated, the censured advertisement respecting my book. I had the very highest encouragement and approbation to bring out this new edition of my arithmetic; my colleagues, of various grades, were most favourable to it; up to the decision of the Board I was led to the confident belief that it would be placed on the Price List, a belief shared in by every one to whom I had spoken upon the subject; and when the unexpected and unfavourable decision was expressed, it was accompanied by the regret of the Commissioners. With the practices of 17 years, as already stated, before me, I printed the bills in question; and if I had had the faintest fear that, in so doing, I was incurring any risk of displeasing the Commissioners, it is clear that I would never have intended them for circulation with impunity throughout the whole of the institution, when it was quite open to me to effect the desired end, the circulation of my book, after the manner of the professors and the other authors mentioned,* all of whom had the wiser discretion to follow the silent and safer course of oral appeals and manuscript circulars.

I deeply regret that the handbill was so framed as to be unsatisfactory to the Commissioners, but an examination of the entire of the facts here set forth, must, I humbly conceive, satisfy every calm and unprejudiced mind that I had the strongest grounds for believing that there was no impropriety in the step taken, as it is scarcely compatible with ordinary sanity, to suppose anything else from the open and fearless mode in which I acted.

With the exception of 50 copies the bills were not circulated by me, and with the exception of one person, I am not aware that even one copy of the book was sold by any officer of the Board, and not one by myself, by my direction, or on my application.

Under all these circumstances the punishment extended to me is severe, beyond all parallel in the history of the national system, and such as I may hope would not have been inflicted if all these facts were known and considered by the Commissioners. Many of them are of opinion that my book has considerable and distinctive merit; some of the best practical judges believe that it is superior in many respects to either of the larger works on the Board's list. I got the warmest encouragement to publish this edition of it, and the circular issued to the inspectors regarding it would lead many of them to closely scan it, expecting to find some open or lurking immorality or sedition in its pages, so strongly are they prohibited from having connexion with it.

It is said that the professors have little or no profit by some of the works which they circulate by the means stated, and that their object is the public good. Granted. I have never made a shilling by my book, and shall be a loser by the present edition. The propriety of the means taken to circulate a work cannot be determined by the audit of the author's profit; or if so, I hope, like them, to escape censure.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries, Education Office.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 12 October 1857.

I BEG leave to request you will attach this letter to mine of the 6th instant, on the subject of the printed Hand Bill, respecting my work on arithmetic.

In Professor Sullivan's circular to the Superintendents, dated 14th April 1842, the following passage occurs in the omitted portion (marked by asterisks): "2d. The Geography.—After waiting three years for a geography, which Mr. Carlisle has engaged to compile, I wrote mine to supply the urgent demand for a work of this kind, till his should appear. The Board, as you are aware, are at no loss by the work, nor am I gainer; in fact I will be a loser by the present edition. Should the work succeed, it will pay.

"The Lectures.—The necessity for something of the kind, particularly for the untrained teachers, led me to publish this work at my own risk and expense. The agreement between the Board and me is this: They take 20,000 copies of the

---

* As well as others not stated.

the book, on condition that I am to refund the money unless they are sold within six months. The price paid, or rather advanced, by the Board, is one shilling a copy in sheets, and the binding will be three pence." The other book referred to in that letter (last sentence) is Sullivan's Dictionary of Derivations.

In the previous spring (2d March 1842) Professor Sullivan sent a circular as follows, to the superintendents, announcing the publication of his Geography Generalized, and like his colleague Professor M'Gawley he encourages therein that the book should be sold to those not in, as well as those in, national schools.

" My dear Sir, " Education Office, 2 March 1842.

" I have written your name in a copy of my geography, and have left it with Mr. Lawrence for you. The lectures I will send you when published.

" You will oblige me by informing the teachers that I have enabled the Board to supply their schools with this geography, substantially bound, for a shilling a copy. It is sold to the public at 1*s.* 6*d.*, in wrapper. As the Board have a halfpenny profit on each copy sold, there is nothing wrong in selling it to any person they please.* The more sold the better for the author.

" I am, &c.

" _____ Esq. (signed) " *Robert Sullivan.*"

" Superintendent National Schools."

In May 1842 another circular was sent by Professor Sullivan, with a view to stir up the superintendents to quicken the circulation of the geography:

" My dear Sir, " Education Office, 22 May 1842.

" You will oblige me by saying how many of the Geography Generalised you " have on hands, and whether you are likely to get them off before Christmas.

" I am, &c.

(signed) " *Robert Sullivan.*"

In order to further the sale of the professor's books, some of the superintendent's established branch depôts at various schools in their districts; the teachers acted as sub-agents, gave returns of the stock and proceeds of sales at stated periods, and forwarded Post-office orders for the amount to the superintendents. I have now before me such a return and letter (25/11/42), enclosing remittance.

These documents sufficiently illustrate how ably and effectively the entire official machinery of the institution was used to start, circulate, and extend the professor's books, those not on, as well as those on the price list, and amongst the general public, as well as in the national schools.

The prospectus of the Schoolmasters' Magazine, issued in September 1839, was also circulated through the agency of the central establishment, and the numbers of the work were sold by the inspectors, who remitted the proceeds to the publisher in Armagh.

As already stated in my letter of the 6th instant, my sole object in submitting these simple facts is to show that several of the Board's officers had been for years, and some yet are, effectively doing what was merely intended to be, but never done, through my printed but uncirculated advertisement.

I have, &c.

(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries, Education Office.

Education Offices, Training Department,

Gentlemen, 13 October 1857.

For the information of the Board, I will explain as briefly as possible Mr. Kavanagh's last statements regarding my books; my letter, which he calls " a circular," was a private one written to four or five of my personal friends, as Mr. Butler, Mr. M'Creedy, and Dr. Patten, and as he has quoted only so much of it as suited his purpose, I request you will call upon him to entrust it to you for my inspection, for I have no copy of it. The object of this letter was to

* By statement already quoted, the Board lost at least 3*d.* a copy for binding.

to communicate an arrangement which had been made by the Board with regard to my lectures and letters on education, and the first edition of the Geography Generalised. The purport of it, I recollect, was that the necessity for giving the large number of untrained and untrainable national teachers some information on the subject of systematic education led me to publish my lectures, and that the Board had purchased from me 2,000 copies (not 20,000, as Mr. Kavanagh states) at half-price (1 *s.* 3 *d.*), and that they were to be sold to the national schools at 1 *s.* 4 *d.* per copy, with the other books; for at the period the Superintendents or inspectors sold the Board's books to the national schools, and in each district there was a depôt. The money, however, which the Superintendents received for my books was sent to the Board, and not to me, for I had already been paid for them. This appears from an official letter which I enclose, No. 1. Its date is 9th April 1842. And by the same letter it will be seen that I was bound to repay the Board for all copies remaining unsold by the inspectors, after a certain date:—"six months after the 1st of May next." My anxiety, therefore, to get off the work before the time mentioned was natural, and as the Board lost nothing by it, but, on the contrary, had a small per-centage for selling it, I was justified in telling them they might sell it to any person that required it. I should add, too, that I had offered this work gratuitously to the Board before I published it, and that I subsequently repeated the offer.—*See* the official letter which I enclose, No. 2.

The facts regarding the publication of the Geography Generalised are similar. When I was appointed to teach geography, the Board had no text-book on the subject, and after waiting upwards of three years for one, I drew up my little work. On its first appearance the Board purchased 3,000 copies of it from me, at about half price, and directed them to be sold to the national schools, with their other books. In the case of this book also, the Board were at no loss by selling it, but on the contrary had a small per-centage on each copy. This appears by the following minute:—

"3d February 1842. Read letter from Mr. Sullivan, directing the attention of the Commissioners to a work on geography about to be published by him, and proposing to supply them with 3,000 copies, in sheets, at 8 ½*d.* each, which, when bound, could be sold to the teachers or managers of national schools for 1 *s.*, and to the public for 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

"Read also a letter from the Rev. Dr. Henry, expressing his approval of the work.

"*Ordered*, That a copy of the work be sent to each of the Commissioners for examination, and also that a copy be sent to the Rev. J. Carlisle, informing him that the Commissioners being of opinion that Mr. Sullivan's work will not interfere with the treatise which he has in preparation, are strongly disposed to sanction its immediate introduction into the national schools."

"10th February 1842. The Commissioners take into consideration Mr. Sullivan's letter of the 3d instant.

"*Ordered*, That Mr. Sullivan be informed that the Commissioners accept his proposal, and have directed he shall be paid 106 *l.* 5 *s.*, being the sum charged by him for 3,000 copies of his work. The Commissioners also approve of Rev. Dr. Henry's suggestion of separating the outline of geography from the other part of the work, and of publishing it in a detached form (this appeared as the Introduction to Geography and History).

With regard to the Outline of the Rules and Regulations and Methods of Teaching in the Model Schools, every one connected with the system knows that it was never sold at all to the national teachers. It was presented by me to the Board for gratuitous circulation among the teachers, and for several years repeated, and large editions of it were distributed. In fact, Mr. Kavanagh himself, both as Head master of the Model school and as District inspector, must have distributed hundreds of copies of it; and yet he states in his letter, "The outline by Professor Sullivan and the Lectures on Natural Philosophy, by Rev. Mr. M'Gawley, were supplied from November 1840 (date of circular), through the storekeeper, and sold for cash (at least the latter work) by the superintendents to the national school teachers." I will make no comments on "at least the latter work." "The circular," referred to in the foregoing sentence, was sent through the storekeeper by the permission of the Board. I cannot at present find a copy of it, but if Mr. Kavanagh sends the one he has,

has, it will be seen that it had the official approval of the Board, and that the storekeeper was permitted to receive the money for the books, and to hand it to the professors. The books on the list had been examined and approved of by the Board, and they were, in fact, supplied by the Board to the teachers in training.

These books were, I think, Mr. M'Gawley's Lectures, and my Dictionary of Derivations, Spelling-book Superseded, and Elements of English Grammar Many country teachers had applied for these books, and an opportunity was thus afforded them to get them at greatly reduced prices. It is to this list a reference is made in the Board's letter, No. 1 (enclosed):—

"Your list of books and prices may be forwarded with the circular now issuing from the office, but the Commissioners prefer that the books not purchased by them should be procured in Dublin, and not from the superintendents."

Mr. Kavanagh had also the bad taste to refer to Mr. Butler's little book, which he says I sold for him to the teachers in training. Thirteen years ago, when Mr. Kavanagh was charged with forcing this same arithmetic on the teachers in the training class, he made the same statement in justification of his own conduct; and in the professor's letter in your office, dated 13th October 1844, the groundlessness of this charge is shown. Mr. Butler wrote and printed at his own expense, for the use of the teachers in his district, "Questions" on the Lesson and other Books sanctioned by the Board, as the Lessons on Reasoning, and my lectures. As the teachers who came from Mr. Butler's district had this little book in their hands, the other teachers, considering that they were placed at a disadvantage, requested me to put them in the way of getting copies. I then wrote to Mr. Butler, and requested him to send any copies that he had remaining to Mr. Rintoul's care, and that he would sell them to any of the teachers that would ask for them. Mr. Butler sent the copies he had on hand (not more than 100, I think), and they were sold at half price by Mr. Butler's directions. In fact, Mr. Butler lost by the little work, and he intended to do so; but Mr. Kavanagh cannot understand this, for though he was told this 13 years ago, he returns to the charge. In fact, the only book which was improperly sold in the Training Establishment was Mr. Kavanagh's own book. If it ever passed through four editions, it was by pressure upon the Glasnevin teachers, class after class, for nearly ten years; and I will also add, that if Kavanagh's Arithmetic possessed the extraordinary merits claimed for it, it would long since have become a standard Class Book in the Public schools not only in Ireland, but also in Great Britain and the colonies. It has been 13 years before the public, and it is as yet scarcely known to the trade.

I am, &c.

The Secretaries, &c. &c. (signed) *Robert Sullivan.*

(No. 1.)

Sir, Education Office, 9 April 1842.

The Commissioners of Education having considered your offer, direct us to acquaint you that they agree to purchase 2,000 copies of your "Lectures and Letters upon Popular Education," at 1 *s.* per copy, upon the condition stated in your letter of the 31st ultimo; namely, that certain passages in the work already pointed out shall be expunged, and that you are "willing to undertake to repay the amount advanced by the Board, in the event of the work not being sold within six months," the period of six months to date from the 1st May next.

Your list of books and prices may be forwarded with the circular now issuing from the office; but the Commissioners prefer that the books not purchased by them should be procured in Dublin, and not from the superintendents.

We are, &c.

(signed) *Maurice Cross.*
James Kelly.

R. Sullivan, Esq.,
&c. &c. &c.
Training Department.

(No. 2.)

Education Office, Training Department,
23 February 1855.

Gentlemen,

You will oblige me by stating to the Board that it is my intention, with their permission, to present them with a manual for the use of the teachers of their schools. This manual will contain, either in the body of the work, or in the appendix, the greater portion of my "Lectures and Letters on Popular Education," which the Board have already sanctioned. But as it is my wish that the intended work should not only be useful, but also unobjectionable to all parties, I purpose to bring it out in detached papers under the following heads: "Notes of Lectures on Education and School-keeping, by Professor Sullivan (not published.)" By bringing out these papers at intervals, and as if for the use of my class, the Commissioners will have time to examine them at their leisure, and to make any suggestions to me that may strike them as necessary. These suggestions I will attend to, if made by any of the Commissioners individually and verbally, which I think would be better than if they were made officially by the Board.

If the Board approve of this plan, it will be necessary to get an order for printing, but not publishing these papers at intervals. But if it is not approved of, I will then bring out the work myself, and offer it officially to the Board for the use of the teachers of national schools. In this case it will be difficult to have alterations or omissions made in it; and in fact the Board will have either to accept or refuse it as it stands.

I am, &c.
(signed) *Robert Sullivan.*

The Secretaries.

(No. 3, in reply to No. 2.)

(1475—55. B. O. 2/3/55.)

Sir,

Education Office, 12 March 1855.

We have laid before the Commissioners of National Education your letter of the 23d ultimo, in which you state your intention to present them with a manual published for the use of the teachers of the national schools, &c., &c.

We are to inform you that the Commissioners decline to inspect the work as you propose; they prefer to examine the proof sheets when the work shall have been completed.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,*
James Kelly,
Secretaries.

Robert Sullivan, Esq., LL.D.
Training Department.

No. 1 (F.)

CORRESPONDENCE between the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools), relative to the manner in which the Official Records of the following Districts have been kept by the Inspectors in Charge, from the 10th April 1857 to 25th July 1857, viz.:

District 17	Mr. Mahoney.	District 25	Mr. Conwell.
„ 19	Mr. Adair.	„ 26	Mr. O'Carroll.
„ 22	Mr. M'Sweeny.	„ 28	Mr. Coyle.
„ 23	Mr. Strong.	„ 35	Mr. Fleming.
„ 24	Mr. Porter.	„ 40	Mr. Clarke.

Gentlemen, Grenville, Rathgar, 10 April 1857.

IN compliance with the instructions of the Commissioners, I beg leave to submit the following report upon the manner in which the official records of the districts are kept by the inspectors connected with me in 1856, viz.: district book, guard book, map, paid monitors' register, note books, and term return.

District 17.—Mr. *Mahony*, Carrick-on-Shannon.

1. District Book.—The standing items as to house, &c., are pretty fully given throughout; but on the whole the rest of book in great arrear, and not at all regularly or formally filled. As a general rule, neither the fees nor the endowments are ever entered, and often the numbers of pupils are omitted. The facts as to the inspection for third term of 1856 are not yet entered.

The index column, which refers to the official action founded on inspector's reports, is scarcely at all filled.

On the whole, book in great arrear, and fails in its important object.

2. Guard Book.—No letter pasted in, or indexed since May 1856. Letters loose in book. On the 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th August, and on 3d September, advice given of 162 letters sent from office founded on inspectors' reports; none of these pasted in, and no record of them under the schools to which they refer in the district book.

3. Map.—Index torn out; only 22 of the 138 schools marked (and rudely) on map.

4. Monitors' Register.—Greatly in arrear; no entry in it since September 1854.

5. Note Books.—Most scantily filled, especially in reference to the examination of the classes and the state of education, methods of teaching, discipline, and school-keeping. Numbers entered, stating the results of examination, but scarcely any entry of the page, or grade of the book, or subject examined on. Inspector states in reference to this, that he makes notes on slates, &c. of these matters, and merely records the numerical results in book. I am quite dissatisfied with the total absence of any reliable record of the detailed examination of the classes.

6. Term Return.—Appears to be correct.

On pointing out to Mr. Mahony the importance of these official documents, and the great arrear and irregularity which he has permitted to accumulate in reference to their keeping, he informed me that it was out of his power to reach on this work, and do his other duties. On looking over his term returns, however, I find that he inspected no schools on four weeks of the third term of 1856, viz., those ending September 6th and 13th, and December 24th and 31st, and some of this time should have been devoted to the proper keeping of his official documents.

I examined a number of the report books and observation books of the schools in this district, and in a few cases I found slight discrepancy between the time spent in inspection as recorded in the two books; thus,—

Kennard National School, 1855, 21/9, 2 ½ o'clock to 4.50 (4 ⅔ in other).
" " 1856, 30/4, 12 (12 ½) to 4 o'clock.
" " 1856, July 3d (4th).
" " 1856, October 8th, 2.20 (2 ½) to 3 ½.
Liscarbon National School, 1855, Dec. 7th, 1 to 3 ¼—1 is 12 ⅔.
" " 1856, July 24th (26th).
Slievenakilla National School, 1855, Nov. 14th, 10 ¾ to 1 o'clock (12 ¾).
Lavoir National School, 1856, Oct. 9th (7th in obs. book) 11 to 12 ½ o'clock.
Drunchinne National School, 1856, March 14th, 11 (10 ¾) to 4 ½.

These evidently as to the hours, arose from haste, oversight, or some such cause, as no officer can have an object in such discrepancies.

I also found that Mr. Mahony never entered any remark of a favourable kind, even when he thought well of the school; but henceforth he will record praise when deserved as well as blame.

The inspection of this district is effected within term, but at great labour to the officer while on duty, and involving serious irregularities in the schools. The inspector was on duty 14 weeks of last term (1856), and during nine of these, he examined and reported on 2 to 2 ½ schools (10 to 13 a week) every day, and the average distance of each of his schools from his centre is 11 ½ miles. The result is, that the time spent in many of the schools is altogether insufficient for the purpose of efficient examination or inspection; a large number of the double schools are examined by bringing the boys and the girls together in the one school; and further, the inspection is often commenced at and after two o'clock, and in order to obtain the materials of his report, the teacher and school are detained by the inspector up to and after nightfall. This is a great hardship, especially to the little children, many of whom have to travel a mile or more to their homes; and in winter, when there is no leave for dinner, they are thus kept fasting far too long. As examples of these, I may cite Drum. and Enis. National School, 75 present, examined from 1 to 5 ¼ o'clock on the 11th November, the sun that day setting at 9 m. past 4 o'clock; Annaduff Male and Female National Schools, 60 present, examined from 2 ⅓ to 5 ½ o'clock, September 15th; Kilmore National School, 61 present, examined from 2 to 5 ⅔ o'clock, September 22d; Lisduff Male and Female National Schools, 46 present, 2 ¼ to 5 o'clock, September 18th; Coralubber, October 30th, 2.40 to 5 o'clock, 46 present; Bridgecarton Male and Female National Schools, 2 to 6.20 o'clock in both schools; Kennard National School, 2 ½ to 4.50, September 21st; and Liscarbon, 2 ¾ to 5 ½ o'clock, 104 present.

I beg leave to call attention to this serious irregularity, that it may be stopped before the managers interpose to direct the teachers to close their schools at the precise time mentioned on the time-table.

District 19.—Mr. *Adair*, Bailieboro'.

All Mr. Adair's official papers are well kept, and none of them in arrear. He complains that he is not able to devote as much time to the educational portion of his duties in the school as formerly, and that the best interests of the schools suffer in consequence.

District 22.—Mr. *M'Sweeny*, Claremorris.

All his official documents are in a state of extreme neglect, arrear, and confusion. I brought them all to the office with a view of showing them to the resident Commissioner, but on hearing the case he was satisfied as to the nature of the matter, and I then returned the books to the inspector. The district book is not properly kept, and is in arrear; the guard book is neglected; the map is spoiled from the rude manner in which the position of the schools is marked; the monitors' register belongs to another district, and contains scarcely a single entry in reference to this district; the term return is filled (because the office requires it), and the note books are scantily filled, and on many grounds their educational contents are of little worth.

District 23.—Mr *Strong*, Roscommon.

I examined the records of this district in a cursory way only when I visited in July 1856, and some of them were tolerably fair. At next visit I shall report in detail upon the various items.

District

District 24.—Mr. *Porter*, Granard.

The examination of the teachers was held at Longford, not Granard; and on speaking over the matter of the district documents with Mr. Porter, and expressing a wish to drive over to Granard and see them, he stated that they were in arrear, and not ready for inspection.

District 25.—Mr. *Conwell*, Trim.

Every official record connected with the district well kept, and everything formal and up to time.

District 26.—Mr. *O'Carroll*, Drogheda.

Business in arrear. Inspector states that he has little or no time to devote to the keeping of the official records, and it is only now he is about to make trial of the note books, never used up to this. He kept notes taken on common paper, and which he has filed for reference.

District 28.—Mr *Coyle*, Dublin.

1. District Book.—Of the 107 schools in district, 26 are in Mr. O'Galligan's charge, and the records of these should be filled by him into Mr Coyle's book. Mr. Mulloy, in the same way, owes other entries. Book very much in arrear on the whole.

2. Guard Book.—Letters all preserved in book, but none, except circulars of 1855, pasted in. No index made out.

3. Map.—Safe and clean, but no schools marked on it as yet.

4. Monitors' Register.—Pretty well kept, but last examination not yet recorded in it.

5. Note Books.—Very fair; should be fuller in the notes about the examination of the classes.

6. Term Return.—He had sent it into the office, but saw a rough copy of it.

The inspection in this district is by far heavier than in any district connected with me; the attendance is the most numerous, and the sanitary condition of the city schools of a very low character.

District 35.—Mr. *Fleming*, Rathdrum.

1. District Book.—Greatly in arrear, and badly kept; useless from the arrear in its more important features.

2. Guard Book.—No letter ever pasted into it; no index; no connexion between it and the district book to indicate the official action in reference to schools.

3. Map.—Very perfect; Mr. Fleming employed or had a person to mark the positions of the schools upon it.

4. Monitor's Register.—None ever kept by him in the district, nor has he the form.

5. Note Books.—Very unsatisfactory; rarely is there any reference to the examination of the children, and the entries are of the most meagre character.

6. Term Return.—Satisfactory.

District 40.—Mr. *Clarke*, Wexford.

1. District Book.—Neatly kept as to form; arrear in some particulars, and information scant.

2. Guard Book.—Fairly kept.

3. Map.—Well kept.

4. Monitor's Register.—Much in arrear. There are 48 monitors in district, and only seven names (10 less 3 off) on register. This book is greatly neglected.

5. Note Books.—I send in two furnished by Mr. Clarke himself as a specimen of the worthlessness of the educational statistics of that district. I requested Mr. Clarke to bring me any two of his note books; at first he questioned the right of a head inspector to see these books, and these are the two which he brought. These two note books contain notes of 92 visits to or inspections of 81 national schools, and from an analysis of these the following deductions are evident:—

1. That Mr. Clarke spends a small number of days out on the business of inspection.

2. In order to make up in some degree for this, when he goes any distance from Wexford, or is at the expense of posting (he keeps no horse), he visits two, three, and sometimes four schools in the day.

3. The average time spent in each of 89 inspections of these 81 schools is two hours 13 minutes, and the average number of pupils present in each school, at his visit, was 47. When the time necessary for official inquiries, examination of accounts, &c., is deducted from this two hours 13 minutes, a very small portion remains for the most important duty an inspector has to perform, the examination of the pupils in the course of instruction pursued.

4. The two note books do not contain even the faintest note or memorandum in reference to any examination of the classes beyond the mere entering of figures on the table of proficiency opposite the classification of the pupils. The two pages intended to record the details of the examination of the classes, &c., are throughout the two books as free from ink or pencil as when they left the Education Office.

5. The numbers which record the proficiency are not entitled to reliance, as the numerous and manifest coincidences between the numbers in certain classes and branches, and the numbers said to have answered satisfactorily in them, are so glaring, and so contradict all that we know of the state of the schools, that experience must reject them as not reliable. Annexed I give the names of the 81 schools, and to 40 of the more obvious cases of these coincidences I have prefixed an asterisk, that the details may be referred to and examined in the inspector's note-books.

I feel deep pain in being thus compelled, from a sense of duty, to lay before the Commissioners this statement in reference to the manner in which Mr. Clarke performs his work, but it is clear I have no other alternative.

6. Term Return.—He stated that he had sent it to the office, but I saw that intended for first term 1857, from which it appears that he had visited ten schools up to 23d January.

These are the ten districts which were in my charge in 1856, but as two of the sub-inspectors, Messrs. Molloy and Barrett, were also engaged therein, I examined their note-books when I met these gentlemen. Mr. Barrett is doing very fairly; Mr. Molloy admirably. Early last year I spent some days with Mr. Molloy, in the city schools, and pointed out to him improved modes of examining and note-taking, and I forward with much satisfaction two of his note-books as specimens of careful and detailed accounts of his inspection. It is to be recollected that the sub-inspectors make no primary reports, yet upon nearly every one of the schools such a report could be made from Mr. Molloy's notes. I suggested still more system to him, and to give up pencil notes and use ink.

Amongst the many important suggestions which this report calls forth, there is one which demands immediate attention, the necessity of having a duplicate of each inspector's journal in the hands of the head inspector of the circuit, on each Monday morning, and also of the term return at the proper time for making it.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries, Education Office.

DISTRICT 40.—WEXFORD.

INDEX to Schools in two of Mr. *Clarke*'s Note-Books.

				PRESENT.
1	Murrintown - -	20 May - -	10½ to 12 o'clock	None.
*2	Piercestown - -	20 May - -	1 to 4 „	96
*3	Danescastle - -	21 May - -	10 to 12½ „	45
*4	Bannow - - -	21 May - -	1 to 3 „	48
*5	Sion - - - -	23 May - -	11 to 3 „	64
6	Caroreigh - - -	21 May - -	8½ to 10 „	36; no examination.
		19 March - -	2 to 2½ „	8; no examination.
*7	Cullinstown - -	26 May - -	10½ to 12 „	42
*8	Taghmon - - -	26 May - -	1 to 3 „	48
*9	Curracloe - - -	3 June - -	11 to 3 „	78
*10	Oilgate - - -	4 June - -	10 to 12 „	78
11	Coolamanie - - -	4 June - -	12 to 3 „	22
12	Baldwinstown - -	5 June - -	10 to 10½ „	None.
13	Rathangan - - -	5 June - -	11 to 1 „	33
*14	Duncormack - -	5 June - -	1½ to 4 „	68
15	Kiltealy - - -	6 June - -	11¾ to 1¾ „	38
*16	Ballindaggin - -	6 June - -	2¼ to 4 „	161
		23 April - -	12 to 2½ „	95
17	Enniscorthy (P. L. U.) -	7 June - -	10 to 3 „	No notes.
*18	Wexford (female) (No. 2)	9 & 10 June -	10 to 3 „	222
19	Tagoat (female) - -	11 June - -	10 to 3 „	53; no examination.
*20	Adamstown (female) -	12 June - -	10¼ to 12 „	13
		19 March - -	12 to 1½ „	14
*21	Adamstown (male) -	12 June - -	12 to 1½ „	16
		19 March - -	11 to 12 „	3
*22	Raheen - - -	12 June - -	2 to 4½ „	19
*23	Ballybawn - - -	13 June - -	8¾ to 10 „	13
*24	Rathduff - - -	13 June - -	10½ to 12½ „	44
*25	Templeludigan - -	13 June - -	1½ to 4 „	72
		19 April - -	9½ to 12½ „	27
*26	New Ross (P. L. U.) -	14 June - -	12 to 5 „	180
27	Clologue - - -	18 June - -	9½ to 12 „	26; no examination.
*28	Ferns (male) - -	18 June - -	1½ to 5 „	66
*29	Ferns (female) - -	18 June - -	12½ to 2½ „	56; no examination.
		25 April - -	10 to 12 „	12
30	Ballyduffe - - -	19 June - -	10½ to 12½ „	45; no examination.
31	Camolin (female) - -	19 June - -	1½ to 3¼ „	42; no examination.
32	Camolin (male) - -	19 June - -	3¼ to 5 „	50; no examination.
33	Ballyvogue - - -	20 June - -	11 to 1 „	46
		22 April - -	3½ to 5½ „	36
34	Coolganon - - -	20 June - -	1½ to 3 „	60
*35	Newtownbarry (male) -	21 June - -	10 to 12 „	48
		24 April - -	12.20 to 2 „	58
*36	Newtownbarry (female)	21 June - -	12 to 2 „	28
		24 April - -	2 to 3½ „	43
*37	Tagoat (male) - -	24 June - -	8½ to 10½ „	23
*38	Kilrane - - -	24 June - -	11 to 1½ „	52
*39	Bree (male) - -	25 June - -	10¼ to 11 „	None.
		18 March - -	10½ to 12 „	11
*40	Bree (female) - -	25 June - -	11 to 1 „	44
		18 March - -	12 to 1 „	5
41	Cushinstown (male) -	26 June (? 25th)	9½ to 11½ „	55
42	Cushinstown (female) -	26 June (? 25th)	11½ to 1½ „	51; scant notices.
43	Rathgarogue (male) -	26 June - -	2 to 4 „	52
			None present, only inspectors.	
44	Rathgarogue (female) -	26 June - -	4 to 5½ „	47; no notes.
*45	Clonroche (female) -	27 June - -	9½ to 11½ „	38
*46	Clonroche (male) -	27 June - -	11½ to 1½ „	45
*47	Donard (male) - -	27 June - -	2 to 4 „	17
48	Donard (female) - -	27 June - -	4 to 5½ „	27; no notes.
49	New Ross (male) - -	28 June - -	9.20 to 11½ „	48
		17 April - -	4 hours - -	117; average about 137.
50	Creakan - - -	28 June - -	12½ to 3 o'clock.	41
*51	Montfield - - -	3 July - -	10 to 2½ „	44
52	Skreen (male) - -	4 July - -	10½ to — „	34
		14 March 1856	9½ to 12 „	22
53	Skreen (female) - -	4 July - -	12½ to 2 „	41
		11 March 1856 -	2½ to 4 „	18; scant examination.
54	Wexford (male) (No. 2)	18 September -	10½ to 2½ „	52
55	Glenbryan - - -	4 March - -	10½ to 2½ „	24
56	Davidstown - -	6 March 1856 -	11 to 3 „	27

(*continued*)

DISTRICT 40.—WEXFORD.—Index to Schools in two of Mr. *Clarke*'s Note books—*continued.*

				PRESENT.
*57	Courtmacuddy (male) -	7 March - -	11 to 12½ o'clock	7
*58	Courtmacuddy (female)	7 March - -	12½ to 1½ „	10
59	Wexford (female) No. 1)	10 March - -	10½ to 2¾ „	181; no notes.
60	Blackwater (male) -	11 March - -	10½ to 12½ „	36
61	Trinity - - -	12 March - -	10½ to 12 „	28
62	Clearistown - -	12 March - -	12½ to 2½ „	33
*63	Forth - - - -	12 March - -	3 to 5 „	38
64	Mulrankin - - -	13 March - -	12 to 2½ „	26
*65	Mayglass - - -	13 March - -	3 to 5 „	82
66	Galbally (male) - -	18 March - -	2 to 3½ „	10
*67	Galbally (female) - -	18 March - -	3½ to 5 „	7
68	Clongeen - - -	20 March - -	No hour - -	No number.
69	Hiltown (male) - -	20 March - -	1 to 3 o'clock	30
70	Hiltown (female) - -	20 March - -	3 to 5 „	26
71	Ballyminn (male) -	7 April 1856 -	12 to 2½ „	44
*72	Ballyminn (female) -	7 April - -	10 to 12 „	52
73	Tullycanna - - -	15 April - -	10½ to 2½ „	29
74	New Ross (female) -	18 April - -	10 to 2½ „	162
75	Oulart (female) - -	22 April - -	11 to 1 „	22
*76	Oulart (male) - -	22 April - -	1 to 3 „	28
77	Castledockrell - -	23 April - -	3½ to 5 „	32
78	Kilmyshall - - -	24 April (? 23d)	10½ to 12 „	20
79	Kingsland - - -	25 April - -	1½ to 3½ „	41
80	Wexford (male) (No. 1)	13 May - -	11 to 3 „	60
*81	Barntown - - -	14 May 1856 -	11 to 3 „	56

J. W. Kavanagh,
Head Inspector.

Sir, Education Office, 28 May 1857.

WITH reference to the report of the 10th April last, furnished by you, setting forth the manner in which the official records of the districts under your charge are kept by the inspectors, we observe that the remarks made with regard to Mr. O'Carroll, District Inspector, are very brief and not sufficiently explanatory.

We are to request that you will furnish the same kind of detailed particulars, in his case, as you have done in those of the other inspectors in connexion with the following books and papers:

The District Book, Guard Book, District Map, Monitors' Register, Term Return.

In case of each of the above-named documents you are to report exactly the state in which you found it.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,*
James Kelly,
Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.,
Head Inspector.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 5 June 1857.

IN compliance with your instructions I beg leave to inform you of the state in which I found Mr. O'Carroll's official documents, on inspecting them yesterday in Drogheda:—

1. *District Book.*—Admirably kept; entries posted up to last week's inspection, and the information fuller than I have met with in any other officer's book. There is one head, however, which he has misapprehended: estimate of teacher's character, and owing to which he did not fill it up until the party left the district; he now understands the correct object of the heading.

2. *Guard Book.*—Two volumes of letters pasted in, paged, and very well indexed; no arrear. Book well kept.

3. *Note Book.*—Extremely well kept, from February 11th last, and information very full. Notes on copy paper, of inspection for '55 and '56, kept in a portfolio.

4. *Map.*—No school ever marked on it; did not know how to enter them.

5. *Paid Monitors' Book.*—He has had no advice as to several recommendations made four months since; some arrear in book; he is about to open a new book and mark up all entries due as to monitors.

6. *Term Return.*—Sent to office.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries,
Education Office, Dublin.

Sir, Education Office, 8 June 1857.

In answer to your letter of the 5th instant, acquainting us with the state in which you found Mr. O'Carroll's official documents on the 4th instant, we are to state that you have entirely mistaken the purport of our letter of the 28th ultimo. What was required, and what was asked of you, was simply to report in detail the state in which you found the several official records in Mr. O'Carroll's charge, at the time when you first examined them.

We are again to request that you will do so, giving from your notes taken at the time of your first inspection of them, and referred to in your report of the 10th April last, a detailed statement, such as you have given in the cases of Messrs. Mahony, Clarke and Fleming, of the precise condition in which you then found Mr. O'Carroll's official books and papers.

You must see that such information is absolutely necessary, in order that the Board may deal equally and fairly with those officers of whose neglect you complain.

We are, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross,* } Secretaries.
J. Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.
Head Inspector.

Sir, Education Office, 3 July 1857.

We are to remind you of our letter of the 8th ultimo, calling for your report, in detail, as to the state in which you found the official records of Mr. O'Carroll's district, at the time when you first examined them, and are to request that you will furnish the required information without further delay.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

Sir, Education Office, 14 July 1857.

We have again to request that you will reply to our letter of the 8th ultimo, relative to the state in which you found Mr. O'Carroll's official books and papers, on your first inspection of them.

We are, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross,* } Secretaries.
J. Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.
Head Inspector.

Sir, Education Office, 18 July 1857.

We have again to request that you will reply without further delay to our letter of the 8th ultimo, regarding the state in which you found Mr. District Inspector O'Carroll's official books.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.
Head Inspector.

Office of National Education,
24 July 1857.

Sir,

Referring to our letters of the 8th of June, and of the 3d, 14th, and 18th instant, calling upon you to report in detail, for the information of the Commissioners, the state in which you found the several official records in Mr. O'Carroll's charge when you first examined them, we are now to request that you will inform us by return of post whether it be your intention to comply with those instructions, and why you have omitted doing so up to the present time.

We remain, &c.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.
Head Inspector.

(signed) *Maurice Cross,*
James Kelly, } Secretaries.

Gentlemen,

Rathgar, 25 July 1857.

In reply to your instructions, I beg leave to state, in reference to the remarks made in my letter of 10th April last, respecting the manner in which Mr. O'Carroll kept his official documents, that Mr. O'Carroll's books were not examined by me, for the following reasons:

I noticed him that on the occasion of my visit to Drogheda to examine the teachers (9th and 10th February), I would examine his various official books, &c.; and for this purpose I appointed, when I arrived there, the evening of the 10th for that duty. Mr. O'Carroll told me that they were all in arrear; that there was no use inspecting them that time; that his other duties so much engaged him as to leave him no time for the books; that he kept no regular note books, as the space was too small therein after the questions for the large hand that he wrote, but that henceforth he would try and fill the proper note books. He stated, however, and I knew of old, that he takes and preserves very ample notes of his inspection, on leaves of common copy paper.

In reply, I informed Mr. O'Carroll, in presence of Mr. Molloy, sub-inspector, whose note books I then examined, and sent some of them to the office, that it was my duty nevertheless to see and examine the books.

Mr. O'Carroll was then delicate, although able to join us at the examination; and on the 10th, the marking of the teachers' written exercises and the business of the classification occupied us to a later hour than I had expected. I sent Mr. O'Carroll home to get his books ready for examination, and was on my way to his house, when I learned that I had scarcely time to be over to catch the last train, which I had arranged to return by, so I turned back and drove to the train. Next, or on an early day, I wrote to Mr. O'Carroll, explaining the cause of the disappointment, and telling him that I expected to go to Drogheda shortly, when I would examine his official documents. On receiving your letter, I visited, 4th June, and reported to you, 5th June, the state in which I then found the several records of District 26.

Beyond Mr. O'Carroll's own admission, as correctly reported in my letter of 10th April, I am unable to supply any further information; and my report with regard to him is precisely similar to that with respect to Mr. Porter, of the Granard District. Wherever the documents were well kept, as in the cases of Mr. Connell and Mr. Adair, I reported in general terms; and where I did not examine them, as in the case of Districts 24 and 26, I gave the officers' own account of them in June. Mr. O'Carroll told me that it was subsequent to my visit in February he had put his documents into shape and had worked up arrears.

I remain, &c.

The Secretaries.

(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

District 26.

Memorandum in reference to Mr. *Kavanagh's* Remarks on Mr. *O'Carroll's* District.

Letter No. 1, dated 10th April 1857, is a report from Mr. Kavanagh, Head Inspector, upon the manner in which the official records of the districts under his charge have been kept by the inspectors in 1856.

In

In this report Mr. Kavanagh professes to show the state of the district book, guard book, map, paid monitor's register, note books, and term return.

In the cases of Mr. Mahony, Mr. M'Sweeny, Mr. Fleming, and Mr. Clarke, he goes most minutely into detail as to the manner in which those documents are kept, and in each case points out instances of much neglect.

As regards District 26, in charge of Mr. O'Carroll, the following is the statement made by Mr. Kavanagh, in the report referred to :—

"Business in arrear. Inspector states, that he has little or no time to devote to the keeping of the official records ; and it is only now he is about to make trial of the note books, never used up to this. He kept notes on common paper, and which he has filed for reference."

These remarks of Mr. Kavanagh, regarding Mr. O'Carroll, having been considered quite too brief, he was called upon by letter of the 28th May 1857 "to furnish the same kind of detailed particulars as in the cases of the other Inspectors referred to, setting forth exactly the state in which he found Mr. O'Carroll's books."

Letter No. 2, dated 5th June 1857, from Mr. Kavanagh, is intended as an answer to the Secretary's letter of the 28th May 1857. Mr. Kavanagh, however, avoids the instructions given in the letter of the 28th May, and gives the state in which he found Mr. O'Carroll's official documents on (yesterday) the 4th June 1857.

This answer not being satisfactory, Mr. Kavanagh was informed, by letter of the 8th June 1857, that he had entirely mistaken the purport of the letter of the 28th May 1857 ; that what was wanted, and what was asked of him, was simply to report in detail the state in which he found the several official records in Mr. O'Carroll's charge at the time when he, Mr. Kavanagh, first examined them.

By this letter, 8th June 1857, Mr. Kavanagh was again requested to do so, giving from his notes taken at the time of his first inspection of them, and referred to in his report of the 10th April, a detailed statement, such as he gave in the cases of Messrs. Mahony, Clarke, and Fleming, of the precise condition in which he then found Mr. O'Carroll's official books and papers. Mr. Kavanagh was told that, to enable the Board to deal equally and fairly with those officers of whose neglect he complained, the information required regarding Mr. O'Carroll's books, &c., was absolutely necessary.

Mr. Kavanagh not having replied to the letter of the 8th June 1857, was reminded of it on the 3rd July 1857.

Again reminded on the 18th July 1857.

Again reminded on the 24th July 1857.

Letter No. 3, dated 25th July 1857, is Mr. Kavanagh's reply, in which he states, with reference to his remarks on Mr. O'Carroll's official documents in the letter of the 10th April 1857, that Mr. O'Carroll's books were not examined by him at all. Assigns as reasons, that having appointed the evening of the 10th February 1857 with Mr. O'Carroll, for the examination of his official books, &c., Mr. O'Carroll informed him that they were all in arrear, and that there was no use inspecting them that time ; that his other duties left him no time for the books ; that he kept no regular note books, but promised to do so in future.

That Mr. O'Carroll was informed, in the presence of Mr. Molloy, Sub-Inspector, that it was his, Mr. Kavanagh's, duty, nevertheless, to see and examine the books.

The delicate state of Mr. O'Carroll's health, and the length of time occupied in the examination of teachers, are given as further reasons by Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. Kavanagh mentions, that having arranged with Mr. O'Carroll, after the marking of the teachers' exercises, to examine his books, he learned that he had scarcely time to catch the last train, which he arranged to return by, so he turned to catch the train ; that he wrote to Mr. O'Carroll, mentioning the cause of the disappointment, and telling him that he would be shortly in Drogheda, and would examine the documents. Books examined on the 4th June 1857.—(*See* Letter No. 2.)

Mr. Kavanagh states that his report on Mr. O'Carroll's official documents, in his letter of 10th April, is similar* to that with respect to Mr. Porter. That wherever the documents were well kept, as in the cases of Mr. Conwell and Mr. Adair, he reported in general terms; and where he did not examine the documents, as in the cases of Mr. O'Carroll and Mr. Porter, he gave the officers' own account of them. That Mr. O'Carroll has told him that he has put his documents into shape, and worked up his arrears since Mr. Kavanagh's visit in February.

No. 1. (G.)

CORRESPONDENCE between the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools); and also with *Robert Sullivan*, LL. D., Superintendent of the Training Department, and Mr. *John Rintoul*, Assistant in ditto, relative to a statement made by Mr. *Kavanagh*, that no opportunity has been afforded to the Teachers in Training of witnessing the mode of teaching the First Book of Lessons, from the 24th of April to the 4th July 1857.

Education Office, Training Department,
24 April 1857.

Gentlemen,

As it has been asserted that the Teachers who have been trained in this Institution are not made acquainted with the improved methods of teaching the alphabet, I feel myself called upon to state, for the information of the Board, that there are no grounds for this assertion. By referring to the official programme,† it will be seen that this is the very first subject which is taken up; and I can state, with confidence, that no class for the last 19 years has left this without having been fully instructed in the best and most approved method of teaching the alphabet.

And in order that the untrained Teachers of our schools might know something of the improvements that had been made in the method of teaching generally, I, so far back as the year 1839, published a little book, called "Lectures and Letters on Education." Among those was a lecture on alphabetic teaching, and so recently as last year the substance of this lecture was republished in "The Papers on Popular Education," and I request particular attention to the last paragraph of it; for, after all, it is the method adopted by the Board that we should recommend; and, more particularly, when it is the easiest and best method that has been, and I will add, that can be devised. In proof of this, I will for the present merely quote an extract or two from letters which I received from Mr. Kavanagh on this subject, in the year 1841. He was then the Teacher of Tullamore National School; and I had said to him, while in training (as I have always been in the habit of saying to Teachers of whose abilities I had formed a high opinion) if you succeed in introducing any improvements in school keeping, or in methods of teaching, you will oblige me by giving me an account

---

* Which, however, it is not; for while in the case of Mr. Porter it is distinctly stated that the official books called for by him were not produced, and therefore not seen or examined, in the case of Mr. O'Carroll, on the contrary, Mr. Kavanagh's statement is so worded as to imply, as it did actually imply, in the minds of the officers here, that he had seen and found in arrear the official books in question.

† *Subjects of Professor Sullivan's Lectures and Examinations.*—1. Best method of teaching the Alphabet—Lancaster's, Jacotot's, Wood's, Pillan's Plans. 2. Improved method of teaching Orthography—Practical Rules for Spelling. 3. The most approved method of teaching Reading—Rules for Reading. 4. Best method for teaching the Meaning of Words—Roots and Derivations—English Grammar and Composition. 5. Easy Lessons in Reasoning, or the Elements of Logic 6. Examinations in the Lesson Books published by the Board. 7. Reviews of the different Systems of Popular Education—Bell and Lancaster—Pestalozzi, Fellenberg, &c. 8. Different methods of teaching—the Intellectual, the Monitorial, the Simultaneous, the Elliptic or Suggestive, and the Mixed or Eclectic methods. 9. Reviews of the principal Treatises on Popular Education, including Abbott's "Teacher" and Hall's Lectures on School-keeping (American writers). 10. Geography and the Elements of Astronomy. 11. The Elements of Political Economy, taking Archbishop Whateley's "Easy Lessons on Money Matters" as the basis; and touching only on those topics which are plain, practical, and corrective of popular prejudices. 12. An Outline of English Literature and General History.

account of them, and I will read your letter publicly to the class, giving your name and the name of your school. Such letters from Teachers (and I have many of them) I have always regarded as official communications and not as private letters.

In a letter dated Tullamore, 1st January 1841, Mr. Kavanagh says, "The Outline is invaluable; it contains excellent instructions in the departments in which Teachers require most and possess least information, how to teach. I was sorry to find your instructions for teaching the alphabet omitted in it; as I practised it since I came here I can with truth say, children would learn the 26 small letters while they would be learning A. B. C. according to the old school plan."

And on my asking him to send me a full account of his success, in order that I might read it to the class, he replies in a letter dated 15th of the same month, "In compliance with your request, I beg leave to briefly state the method of teaching the alphabet practised by me, and which is (with scarcely any difference) the plan suggested by you in your invaluable Lectures on the Art of Teaching. The plan is so simple and rational that any person, upon hearing it, cannot but be struck with its practicability and usefulness; but I question if any person could at first anticipate such signal success from its application as I have met with." He then gives in detail his application of the method, and concludes: "any teacher, how incompetent soever, may in this way convey to the most stupid child a knowledge of the alphabet in a week, what was in Mr. Byrne's days the work of months; yes, sometimes of a year!" "So much for *your* method of teaching the alphabet as applied by me."

What he calls my method, and italicises as such, is, as I have stated in my Lecture, the method which the Board have adopted and recommended in their First Book of Lessons, which has been successfully used in thousands of schools for the last 23 years. It well deserves all the praises which Mr. Kavanagh has given to it, for a simpler or more philosophic plan could not be devised.

This plan, and the whole of the arrangement of the First Book of Lessons, we owe to the founders of the Edinburgh Sessional School, as may be seen by referring to Mr. Wood's book. (*See* also Professor Pillan's account of the method of teaching how to read in this school, which I now enclose.)

I shall only add, that if any plan has been discovered since, "which will enable any teacher, how incompetent soever to convey to the most stupid child a knowledge of the alphabet in (less than) a week," the Board should adopt it at once, and the discoverer should be honoured and rewarded as the greatest benefactor of children that the world has yet seen. One word more: I hope that the method suggested is not a mechanical one, either new or old; such toys may be suited for nurseries, or for *ad captandum* displays in public, but it is absurd to think that they could be used, except at great expense and with very little success, in the thousands of schools under the Board.

I am, &c.

The Secretaries. (signed) *Robert Sullivan.*

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 4th May 1857.

I BEG leave to submit, for the information of the Commissioners, the following statement in reference to the instructions lately given by me to considerable numbers of the National teachers in and about Dublin, upon school matters.

Saturday, 7th March.—The nature, object, and advantages of organisation, and the leading duties of organisers, were explained to 66 teachers from both the Dublin districts; and the members of the Men's Special Class were also present.

Saturday, 21st March.—Instruction and explanation on the subject of organisation were given to 33 teachers, for two hours.

Saturday, 28th March.—The teachers of the North Dublin District only were summoned, but many from the south side also attended; subject of instruction, "School Accounts and Educational Statistics." Present, 52 teachers.

Saturday, 4th April.—There were 79 teachers present; subject, "The little New Comers and their Halfpenny Primer;" and also, some unnoticed points in reference to our school accounts.

On all the previous occasions the teachers met in one of the lecture rooms in the Training Department, but the two following meetings were held in St. Paul's National School, Queen-street, as the situation was considered more central for the teachers who were in town attending the written examination. These meetings were held in the evening at seven o'clock, whereas those in Marlborough-street were held at one o'clock in the day. There were 71 teachers present on the evening of the 16th of April, and 68 on the evening of the 17th; subject on both, the "First Book of Lessons."

Saturday, 18th April.—The instruction was resumed in Marlborough-street; present, 102 teachers; subject, "First Book of Lessons."

Saturday, 25th April.—Eighty teachers attended; subject, "First Class," how to carry out its school programme, including the following points, reading, spelling, grammar (to class words), arithmetic (first notions of number), and subjects of general intelligence suited to young children.

Saturday, 2d May.—About 105 teachers attended; but as I had been out of town, and not arriving at one o'clock, some persons told the teachers that I had not returned from the country, and that there would be no instruction, so that on my arrival at two o'clock all had left with the exception of 25 teachers, and these I instructed on the teaching of penmanship, dictation, grammar, &c. I then read to them the order of the Commissioners, with the exception of the last paragraph in it, directing the discontinuance of the Saturdays meetings henceforth, and informed them that I intend to avail myself of the occasion of the approaching examination of the Dublin teachers, in order to complete the entire of the subjects upon which I had arranged to instruct them.

Up to Easter, all the organisers in town who were not otherwise engaged attended the instruction, and since Easter the four connected with my circuit were regular in their attendance. The teachers and assistants from West Dublin Model, from Inchicore, and from Glasnevin Schools, were nearly all present regularly. Mr. Young (once), Mr. O'Sullivan, and Mr. Sheehy, as also Dr. Clarke attended; Messrs. Barrett and O'Galligan, Sub-Inspectors; Coyle and M'Dermott, District Inspectors; Sheahan, Keenan, Hunter, and Newell, Head Inspectors; Mr. M'Creedy and the Right honourable A. Macdonnell, Resident Commissioner, were amongst those present on one or more occasions. The members of the Special Class, and several teachers from the south side of the city, expressed a wish to be present; but I deemed it better, in order to preclude all ground of misapprehension, to deny admission, after the first or second day, to all teachers under training, and merely to permit, but neither to invite nor encourage, the attendance of a few of those from the south side, should there be room for them in the lecture room. On the five days in April that the instruction was upon Method in the Lowest Classes, the average number of teachers present each day was 80, and of persons 100; so that I may state with confidence that not less than 140 different teachers received more or less instruction.

The teachers were supplied with note-books, pencils, and a copy of the First Lesson Book, and each teacher has forwarded to me the notes as taken, or rather those somewhat expanded, so as to exhibit the leading principles and facts set forth in the course of my instruction. All of these papers give proofs of great attention on the part of the teachers; and although very varied, as might be expected, owing to differences in the ability and power of observation of the parties, without exception they all afford ample evidence that the teachers are now satisfied as to the paramount importance of the method of teaching the junior classes, of the serious defects in the generality of our schools in this respect, and of the various means for their correction. Not only their attention, but that of numbers of others through those who attended, is awakened to the deeply important fact, that the pupils in First Bock constitute half the gross number in our schools, and that from their ranks the recruits must be advanced to fill the places of those who, leaving school from the higher classes, go out into the several walks of life.

I shall in a few days send in a list of the teachers who attended, and a few of the papers which they have written on the subject of my instruction. I shall also

also forward, when Mr. Joyce shall have made it out, an account of the actual locomotive expenses incurred by the teachers, and paid by me, amounting to about 9 *l.* It does not amount to more than 1 *l.* each day for the instruction of such a large number of teachers, and to effect this my duties were in nowise interfered with; and as most of the schools are closed on Saturday, and the hour of meeting having been one o'clock, little inconvenience arose to either schools or teachers.

Many of these teachers were trained; but I feel bound to call attention to the fact, that no opportunity has been afforded to the teachers while in training (at least I state so confidently as to the men) to witness the mode of teaching the First Book of Lessons. They never see it taught; and even if they did, there is no person in the Training Department, now connected with that branch, who has had any experience of the existing defects in the ordinary National Schools throughout Ireland, and consequently there is no one who could bear upon the question like one of your experienced inspectors.

I know, and every one who has heard a few of the lessons knows, that a vast amount of good has been done to the teachers by the few days instruction; and, so far as the junior classes are concerned, inspection is simplified on the north side of Dublin.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries, Education Office.

Gentlemen, Training Department, 12 June 1857.

In returning Mr. Kavanagh's letter of 4th May, for the perusal of which I have to express my thanks, I beg to state that the only portion of it which concerns me, is the following paragraph :—" I feel bound to call attention to the fact that no opportunity has been afforded to the teachers while in training (at least I state so confidently as to the men), to witness the mode of teaching the First Book of Lessons. They never see it taught; and even if they did, there is no person in the Training Department, now connected with that branch, who has had any experience of the existing defects in the ordinary National Schools throughout Ireland, and consequently there is no one who could bear upon the question like one of your experienced inspectors."

In so far as this paragraph contains merely matter of opinion, I abstain from noticing it; but as it purports to state a fact, which yet is no fact, I must say, in self-defence, that Mr. Kavanagh has no grounds for his statement, and that if it were true, as he alleges, that the teachers in training have no opportunity of witnessing the mode of teaching the First Book of Lessons, and that they never see it taught, then I ought to be called before the Board and reprimanded for a dereliction of duty, inasmuch as this is one of the subjects with which I am specially charged. So contrary, however, is the real fact, that for many years past I have myself taught and heard the teachers, both male and female, teach the First Book thoroughly, and have frequently had occasion to express to the various classes my regret at the length of time we were compelled to remain over that book, but that I felt the importance of their teaching it well.

It may, perhaps, be in the recollection of the Resident Commissioner, that about nine years ago or more he introduced the late Mr. Joseph Hume, M.P., into the lecture room when I was in the act of teaching the First Book to a class of boys brought up from the Model School, in presence of the teachers in training, on which occasion Mr. Hume made some pertinent remarks on the advantage of teaching on an intellectual system from the very beginning, and expressed his satisfaction that a rational system had been adopted in our Training Institution.

In regard to teaching the alphabet, my practice has been to elicit from the teachers the various methods adopted in their schools. A familiar discussion then takes place, and the merits and demerits of each plan are considered. The different methods that have been proposed by educationists are then explained, and the plan of the First Book, which is that of the "Sessional School," pointed out. So careful have I been in this matter, that I have taken pains to show the teachers that they should commence at page 6, and go over the first three lessons of section 1, before they make use of the alphabet at all, and that they

they are to use the latter, not for the purpose of teaching the letters, but as an examination exercise after the pupils have learned them from the above mentioned lessons. I have also, for obvious reasons, suggested to the teachers the propriety of dividing these lessons into six or eight parts. I was one of the parties consulted in the compilation of this book, and before it was published I pointed out the anomaly of putting the alphabet before section 1, as it did not accord with the proposed plan of teaching it; and subsequently, in 1835 or 1836, I urged on Doctor MacArthur the propriety of making the alteration; and so far as I can recollect, the only reason assigned for permitting it to remain unaltered was that, as the alphabet was not to be used in the ordinary way, it mattered little where it stood, while it looked better at the beginning like other primers.

I trust I may be forgiven for having written at such length, as I have taken up my pen solely in self-defence.

I have, &c.
(signed) *John Rintoul.*

(3781/57. B. O. 19/6/57.)

Office of National Education,
Sir, 24 June 1857.

We have laid before the Commissioners of National Education your letter of the 12th instant, containing your remarks upon the statement made by Mr. Kavanagh, Head Inspector, in his communication of the 4th ultimo, to the effect that no opportunity has been afforded to the teachers in training (particularly the men) to witness the mode of teaching the First Book of Lessons.

We are now directed to state that the Commissioners consider the explanation in your letter satisfactory.

We are, &c.

J. Rintoul, Esq.
Moyrally House, Enfield.

(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

(B. O. 19/6/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 4 July 1857.

Your letter of the 4th May last, stating that no opportunity has been afforded to the teachers in training to witness the mode of teaching the First Book of Lessons, having been referred to Mr. Rintoul, Assistant Professor, we are to state that he has forwarded a letter of explanation, dated 12th ultimo, of which we enclose you a copy, and that the Commissioners of National Education consider it satisfactory.

We are, &c.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.
Head Inspector.

(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

No. 1. (H.)

Correspondence between the Commissioners of Natural Education, Ireland, and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools), relative to his habitual delay and irregularity in the transmission of his weekly Journals; in replying to communications addressed to him from the Office, and to other matters of a similar nature, from 3d July to 5th October 1857.

Sir, Education Office, 3 July 1857.

On the 6th December last we forwarded to you, for any observation you might have to make, a letter of the 22d November last, from Mr. James Browne, District Inspector, suggesting some amendments in the Class Rolls for National Schools.

We

We are to direct that you will return his letter without further delay, with any remarks you have to offer on the subject to which it relates.

We cannot but express our astonishment at the delay which you have allowed to occur with regard to this matter; a period of nearly seven months having elapsed since you were written to thereon.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

(B. O. 24/7/57. Official Memorandum.)

Office of National Education,
27 July 1857.

Sir,

We are directed by the Commissioners of National Education to transmit to you a copy (herewith enclosed) of a statement submitted to them from the Inspection Department, respecting the habitual delay and irregularity that have taken place in the transmission of your weekly journals, and in replying to communications addressed to you from this office.

We are to state to you that the Commissioners have felt much surprise and dissatisfaction at the state of things represented in the memorandum referred to, and they direct that you will, before the next meeting of the Board, furnish an explanation respecting each item in the statement.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

James W. Kavanagh, Esq.
Head Inspector.

(No. 1.)

Mr. *James W. Kavanagh*, Head Inspector.

Inspection Department, 24 July 1857.

Head Inspector's journals for the weeks ended on 4th, 11th, and 18th instant, have not yet been received in office, and consequently the manner in which Inspector's time has been occupied for the last month is quite unknown here.

Attention requested to the following abstract of letters, written to Mr. Kavanagh since 22d September 1856, on the subject of the transmission of his journals.

22d September 1856 - -	Journals for weeks ended 6th, 13th, and 20th instant, called for.
1st October 1856 - -	Journals for weeks ended 6th, 13th, 20th, and 27th ultimo, called for. The omission to forward them causes inconvenience, and leaves office in ignorance of Inspector's address.
23d October 1856 - -	Journals for weeks ended 4th, 11th, and 18th instant, called for.
5th November 1856 - -	Journal for week ended on 1st instant, called for. It is essentially necessary that the office should know his arrangements.
22d November 1856 - -	Journal for week ended on 15th instant, called for.
10th December 1856 - -	Journals for weeks ended on 15th, 22d, and 29th ultimo, and 6th instant, called for.
22d December 1856 - -	Journals in arrear, called for.
2d January 1857 - -	Journals for past seven weeks, called for.
6th March 1857 - -	Journals for weeks ended on 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th ultimo, called for.
19th March 1857 - -	Journal for last week, called for.
9th July 1857 - -	Journal for week ended 4th instant, called for.

Inspection Department, 24 July 1857.

J. D.

The following is a Return of Letters on different subjects written to Mr. Kavanagh, of which he has been reminded, but which he has not as yet answered.

6th December	1856	Letter of this date, calling for his observations as to a suggestion of Mr. Browne (James), in reference to the Class Rolls.
3d July	1857	Reminded.
3d January	1857	Letter of this date, for his opinion as to suggestion of Mr. Conwell, District Inspector, to give a book, barometer, thermometer, &c., to Model Schools.
18th February	1857	Reminded.
19th January	1857	Requested to furnish a list of the schools under his supervision, which he would recommend for organisation.
3d March	1857	Reminded.
4th May	1857	Letter of this date, sending Mr. Clarke's refutation of Mr. Kavanagh's statements, for any observation Mr. Kavanagh might wish to make.
8th June	1857	Letter of this date, requesting his opinion as to the manner in which Mr. Carroll, District Inspector, keeps the books of his district.
3d July	1857	Reminded.
14th July	1857	Reminded.
18th July	1857	Reminded.

Gentlemen, Grenville-Rathgar, 28 July 1857.

YOUR letter of the 27th instant calls on me to explain why my journals for the 4th, 11th, and 18th instant, have not been sent into the office, and why replies have been delayed to the following letters; one containing a suggestion from Mr. James Browne, Inspector, as to class rolls; one from Mr. Conwell as to barometaic and other observations and records in Trim; and one of January last upon the organisation of the Dublin schools.

First as to the letters. It is well known, known to those in the Inspection Office, that I have given Mr. Browne's suggestion consideration, and that in my addresses to the teachers in Marlborough-street, last March, I spoke favourably of it; but not formally replying to it can, as I well know, cause no official inconvenience, as from its nature it would be quite useless, until some modification of the Class Rolls was about to be made, and I kept it and many other suggestions by me until I saw some likelihood of such change. Next, Mr. Conwell's suggestions: many months since, I told Dr. Clarke that I wished his advice and counsel on this subject. He was overworked most of the time since, and unable to take it up with me; and just before his departure for Templemoyle I called on him upon this matter, and we agreed to postpone it until his return after vacation. It is an important question, and requires more careful consideration than you would at first suppose. The third letter should not have been quoted as in arrear, that in reference to the organisation of the City of Dublin Schools. My whole occupation, which you were well aware of, for the month of March, is the reply to it, the introduction of the organisation into the Dublin schools in the face of many obstacles.

You also refer to two other letters, but the replies to which you acknowledge having received before you wrote your communication of the 27th. In reference to one of these letters, that of Mr. Clarke, I beg to remind you that my report is dated 21st January last, Mr. Clarke's remarks thereon, dated 11th March; that your letter thereon is dated 4th of May; that owing to the size of the parcel, &c. and being from home,* I did not receive it until 10th of May, and that my reply dated the 25th instant, is the earliest that I could forward, owing to other duties, and to the lengthened and detailed nature of the communication to be answered.

As to the three journals in arrear, no inconvenience can have arisen therefrom, as my address was known to the Inspection Office, and the cause of the delay

---

* You had my correct address in the office, but it was not attended to.

delay was neither neglect nor inattention. I can never engage that my journals will reach precisely on Monday morning each week, nor could any one who knows anything of the life of a Head Inspector expect such. I feel, and have ever felt, that in the main the rule is a right one; but I am not surprised that sometimes delay has arisen in my transmission of them. If a return be called for of the arrear of the journals of all the Head Inspectors since 1847, I am quite content to stand on my 10 ½ years' regularity. Whenever there has been any unusual delay in the transmission of my journals, I have invariably sent an explanation.*

I am sorry that the arrear of a few weeks' journals and two letters—these received before you wrote: the delay as to the other two has been explained—should be deemed matter for dissatisfaction, and I can only state that my undivided time is devoted to my duties, and that I am perfectly conscious I never deliberately, and of my own neglect, cause the slightest arrear in the transmission of official papers. These journals, and a reference to the two letters, shall be forwarded without delay.

I am, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh*,
Head Inspector, National Schools.

The Secretaries,
Education Office.

MEMORANDUM for Mr. *M'Creedy*, with Head Inspector *Kavanagh*'s Letter of 28th July 1857.

1. LETTER of Secretaries did not refer to the Journals for the weeks ending 4th, 11th, and 18th instant merely, or principally, but to nearly all his journals since September 1856. The delay in transmitting them has been habitual. Numerous instances were quoted in the statement submitted to the Board; the Commissioners called for an explanation as to each item in that statement; but Mr. Kavanagh takes notice of one item only as far as the journals are concerned.

2. Head Inspector was also asked why replies to our letters in the cases of Mr. Clarke and Mr. O'Carroll, and to our reminders (of which three were written in the latter case) had not been furnished. These he omits to notice as portions of the complaint against him. True, replies in those cases reached the office on the evening of the day on which he was written to, but they had not arrived when the matter was brought under the notice of the Board, and he was therefore bound to state the cause of the delay.

In Mr. O'Carroll's case, he was called on five times altogether. After the receipt of the fifth letter he replied, but it does not appear in that reply, nor in this letter, why he did not answer our communication previously.

3. Mr. Kavanagh states, that it was well known in the Inspection Office that he had given Mr. Browne's suggestion consideration. None of the clerks in Inspection Office were aware that he had done so. However, what we had reason to complain of was that he did not reply to our letter or to our reminder.

4. As regards Mr. Conwell's suggestion, Mr. Kavanagh, on receipt of the letter of the 27th instant, wrote to say he approved of it, and recommended its adoption.

5. As to the letters addressed to Mr. Kavanagh, regarding the duties of the organisers, copies of which are attached, one was written to him on the 19th January, telling him that the organisers would return from Belfast about the close of February, when they were to be engaged in organising the Dublin schools, and requesting him meanwhile to communicate with the city inspectors, Messrs. M'Dermott, Coyle, and O'Galligan, and also with the local managers, as to the schools to be organised, and to send a list of the schools that might be selected to this office.

To

---

* *See* my letter, 3/1/57.

To this letter Mr. Kavanagh never replied, and what is more he wholly neglected to act upon its instructions; for on the arrival of the organising teachers here in Dublin on the 28th of February, it was discovered that Mr. Kavanagh had made no due preparations whatever for their arrival; had sought no interview with managers or patrons, to prepare them for the services of the organisers, and had not even informed the inspectors, Messrs. M'Dermott, Coyle, and O'Galligan, of what was contemplated.

The consequences of this were:—

1st. That the organising teachers, 12 men and three women, were kept idle in the city for nearly a fortnight, no schools being prepared for them; and

2dly. As the Resident Commissioner is well aware, such were the misconceptions, fears, and jealousies, which were excited among the managers, owing solely to the haste in which the matter was finally taken up by Mr. Kavanagh, that the whole system of organisation was put in peril, and the enterprise had nearly made shipwreck at its very outset.

The second letter, of the 3d March, a copy of which is also attached, reminded Mr. Kavanagh of the preceding one of the 19th January, and again requested him to send in a list of the schools selected for organisation; but neither to this did Mr. Kavanagh ever reply.

6. No one in Inspection Office knew Head Inspector's address for the last month, though he says it was well known to the office; it was known that his family lives at Rathgar, but nothing more. However, the point referred to in our letter was not his address, but the "occupation of his time for the last month."

7. It will be found on reference to documents that Dr. Newell's journals have reached this office with the utmost regularity on the Monday succeeding the week to which they had reference. Mr. Hunter's journals, in like manner, are forwarded punctually, at least they reach the office on either Monday or Tuesday. But the point complained of was not that the journals did not arrive on Monday morning, or on Tuesday, or on Wednesday, but that they did not arrive for three and four weeks, and even for seven weeks in one instance. Monthly transmission has been the rule with Mr. Kavanagh, weekly the exception.

8. The incorrectness of quotation, "a few weeks journals and three letters," has been already noticed.

Mr. Kavanagh states that whenever any unusual delay has occurred in transmission of his journals he invariably sent an explanation.

During the period referred to in the memorandum laid before the Board only two letters on this subject were received from him, one stating that he was obliged to hold a journal over for a week, the other is the one quoted in the margin of his letter, and was called forth by a remonstrance from the office.

Sir, Education Office, 19th January 1857.

We have to inform you that it has been arranged that so soon as the organising teachers at present under the superintendence of Mr. Keenan, Head Inspector, shall return from Belfast, where they are about proceeding, and it is likely will remain for upwards of a month, they are to undertake the organisation of such of the city schools as may in the interval be named by you for the purpose.

You are accordingly requested to communicate on the subject at your earliest convenience, with the city inspectors, Messrs. M'Dermott, Coyle, and O'Galligan, as also with the managers of such schools as you and they may think in want of the services of these teachers, and furnish a list of such schools to this office.

We are, &c.

(signed) *M. Cross,* } Secretaries.
J. Kelly. }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

Sir, Education Office, 3 March 1857.

We have to remind you of our letter of the 19th of January last, and are to request that you will furnish, with the least possible delay, a list of such of the city schools as you consider in need of the services of organising teachers.

We are, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross*, } Secretaries.
J. Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.,
Head Inspector.

Extract from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board, dated 21 August 1857.

The Secretary lays before the Board a letter from Mr. J. W. Kavanagh, Head Inspector, dated 28 July, in explanation of the statement submitted to the Commissioners at their meeting on the 24th of that month, with regard to his neglect in not replying to official communications, delay in forwarding his weekly bills, &c.

Ordered, That the Commissioners having been informed that there are several communications in the office from Mr. Kavanagh relative to matters in which a difference of opinion exists between him and some of the District Inspectors, direct that the decision on this particular case be postponed until a digest be made of the communications referred to, which is to be laid before a special meeting of the Board.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 5 October 1857.

I was much surprised to find by an official memorandum which I read in the office, that my letter of 28th July has not been deemed a sufficiently full reply or explanation to yours of the previous day, communicating an order of the Commissioners in reference to the transmission of journals and replies to letters by me.

Reference to my letter will satisfy you that I give therein specific replies upon the several items: journals and letters then in arrear, and also a general explanation as to the alleged irregularities in the transmission of my journals. I evaded nothing, but gave such answer to the terms of your letter, coupled with the nature of the memorandum attached to it, as seemed to me to require.

The refusal of the Commissioners (B. O. 25/9/57) to inform me of the several matters in reference to me which they are about to consider, and as it is certain that this alleged neglect on my part is one of the matters, I owe it to myself, and to the Board, to furnish a correct statement of the case, and from the full and detailed examination of which the treatment to which I am subjected will be clearly seen.

1. Arrear in Journals.

In the year ending last week I was written to 12 times for journals, at the following dates :—

22 September 1856.—I was then in Greystones;* the office was in regular communication with me there; reports and letters from me were received from that address, and the office was fully aware that I was occupied in the inspection of schools.

1st and 23d October 1856.—During this month I was in Dublin, and frequently in and out of the office, so that both my address and my duties were known.

5th and 22d November 1856.—Letter of November 5 (Wednesday) called for my journal of 1st, which, by the practice of the office, was only in arrear from

* Where I was sent by my medical adviser on account of my health being delicate.

from the 4th (Tuesday), and letter of the 22d called for a journal the receipt of which on the 18th would have been deemed satisfactory. I was in the office frequently during both weeks, and my address and occupation were both known.

10th and 22d December 1856, and 2d January 1857.—These three letters refer to journals for November and December. I forwarded a special letter of 3d January 1857, explaining the cause of this unusual delay in my journals.

6th March 1857.—Letter refers to journal for four weeks in February; two of the four were Saturdays, when I was engaged on duty, which precluded me from my usual duties. Thus: February 7th I was travelling all day, from Wexford to Dublin, and Saturday, 28th, I inspected four National Schools, with a view to their organisation. I was in constant correspondence with the office during the month, so that both my address and my duties were known.

19th March 1857.—Journal of the week ending 14th, expected by the 17th (a holiday in the office), called for. On the 14th (Saturday), I was engaged from 10 to 6 o'clock in sending out and bringing with me depôt supplies of apparatus to Dublin schools; and on the 16th and 18th I was occupied in visiting schools, in attendance on his Excellency the Earl of Carlisle, and in calling on clergymen respecting school organisation. I was in the office daily, and my address and duties were well known.*

9th and 27th July 1857.—The three journals, those for the 4th, 11th, and 18th July, here referred to, conclude the list, and formed the immediate subject of the Board's Order communicated in your letter of 27th July. During this month my health was very poor, and the sudden death of a near relation depressed my spirits, and not only took away my mind from my routine business, but on the 18th (*see* my journal), when the arrear of the journals for the two previous weeks would have been made out, I was called away to the country on urgent family business in reference to my deceased friend.

I beg to call attention to the general question as to the journals, now that I have gone over every item in the memorandum. Since March 1855 I have been residing in Dublin, and my frequent calls at the office, especially if changing my address by going to the country, never allowed my address to be a matter of doubt; in proof, I beg leave to state, that owing to neglect on this point no letter of communication of any kind has during this period either been delayed or has miscarried. As stated in my explanation of 18th July, I fully admit that it is extremely desirable that the very journal should be in the office, as required; but the inconvenience arising from the instances of its not being so has been entirely and most seriously exaggerated in this case. The Commissioners would naturally rise from the perusal of the documents before them, but not yet officially known to me, with the conviction that, either through wilful and habitual negligence, or worse, through contempt for the routine requirements of the Inspection Office, I failed to forward my journals, and when called on for explanation, that I designedly evaded the leading points to which my attention was called.

I pray the attention of the Commissioners to the following statement:—Saturday is the day set apart for official correspondence, including the making out of my journal for the previous week; now, during the 11 months to which the above dates refer I had been on extra and laborious duties of another kind on not less than 16 Saturdays. Thus:—

Saturday, 20th December 1856.—In Bailieborough District Model Schools, and travelling to Dublin, 77 miles, 10 ½ o'clock, p.m.

Saturday, 10th January 1857.—Classification of teachers in Drumsna (Leitrim), and travelling 97 miles to Dublin, 10 ½ o'clock, p.m.

17th January 1857.—Writing out classification returns of male and female teachers of District 24 (Granard), examined this week

31st January 1857.—Ditto as to examination of teachers of District 28 (North Dublin) and 35 (Wicklow), examined this week.

7th February

* The three objects of our journal are, to record our expenses, 1; and arrear in forwarding it is never complained of under that head, as such causes a delay in the payment of our accounts: our past week's occupation, 2: and our future week's intended employment, and address, 3.

7th February 1857.—Travelling from Wexford to Dublin, 93 miles.

28th February 1857.—Inspected four National Schools, with a view to their organisation: interviews with manager.

7th March 1857.—Explained to 66 teachers in the rooms of the training department, by direction of the Commissioners, the nature, objects, and advantages of the proposed organisation of the City of Dublin Schools.

14th March 1857.—Engaged from 10 to 6 o'clock with organisers in sending out apparatus to the City Schools.

21st March 1857.—Instructed 33 teachers in Marlborough-street, 5½ to 6¾ o'clock, evening. Lecture to teachers. His Excellency the Earl of Carlisle present.

28th March 1857.—Instructed 52 teachers in Marlborough-street on school accounts.

4th April 1857.—Instructed 79 teachers.

18th April 1857.—Instructed 87 teachers.

25th April 1857.—Instructed 100 teachers.

2d May 1857.—Instructed about 40 teachers.

On these last eight Saturdays several of the inspectors (head, district, and sub) and of the gentlemen connected with the Training and Model School department attended; the actual travelling expenses of the teachers were paid by the Board, and the resident Commissioner kindly attended on one of the days of instruction.

Saturday, 9th May 1857.—I inspected three National Schools in Mayo, and travelled 30 miles.

Saturday, 23d May 1857.—Writing examination papers for female teachers for 1857.

Saturday, 20th June 1857.—Had to attend a dying relative.

Saturday, 18th July 1857.—Engaged as to death of relative.

It is quite evident that the official duty done on these days deranged my ordinary work, and obliged me to postpone my correspondence, &c., supposed to be done on Saturdays, caused arrear and irregularity to the extent stated as to the punctual transmission of my journals; but I altogether deny that the office was either ignorant of my address or unacquainted with my occupation to the extent stated.

Further, I invited, in my letter of 28th July, a comparison of the relative punctuality of all the Head Inspectors as to the transmission of journals; but instead, a return is given embracing Mr. Hunter's practice, my colleague for about as many months as I have been years Head Inspector, and Dr. Newell's.

Now, neither of these gentlemen was engaged in Saturday duty of an extra kind such as I have detailed, and up to last March both gentlemen were stationed in the provinces, where the non-transmission of their journals could not be supplied to some extent by a call to the office. I wanted a return for the past 11 years which would embrace Messrs. Butler, M'Creedy, myself, Dr. Patten, Mr. Sheahan, Dr. Newell, and Mr. Keenan, especially as to the first two, as they had been stationed in Dublin.

I may add, that my journals have been regularly forwarded since July, save one week, when I wrote a letter instead; and for the last seven months I have received but three letters on the subject.

2. Arrear in replying to Letters.

The letters referred to in the memorandum accompanying your communication of 27th July are 11, bearing upon five subjects: 1. Mr. Browne's suggestion as to class rolls; 2. Mr. Conwell's suggestion as to meteorological instruments

for Trim Model School; 3. List of schools to be organised in Dublin; 4. Mr. H. P. Clarke's reply to my report upon the monitors of his district; and 5. Mr. O'Carroll's manner of keeping his official records.

In my letter of 28th July, I explained the cause of the delay as to 1 and 2, and also as to 4; the other two I shall now notice. First, as to Mr. O'Carroll's manner of keeping his books; I reported upon Mr. O'Carroll (10/4/57), just as I had done in the case of the other officers, and in a general report upon all of them; but on receiving further instructions, I proceeded at once to Drogheda, examined his books, and next day reported by letter the result. On receipt of this letter you write to me intimating that I misconceive your instructions, although I followed them strictly, and in the sense in which I considered they could alone be understood, and three letters within a fortnight were sent to me, reminding me to report upon the matter. That fortnight almost immediately followed the death of a relative, already referred to; and 25th July, three days before the receipt of the Board's Order, I replied, showing that I could furnish no further information beyond that contained in my reports of 10th April and 5th June, and that I had dealt with Mr. O'Carroll as I had with other officers.

The last letter remaining (No. 3) requires especial notice, and I trust the Commissioners will patiently enter into its details. January 19th last a letter was addressed to me informing me that the organisers were then about to proceed to Belfast, where they were "likely to remain for upwards of a month, when they were to return to Dublin and organise such of the city schools as in the interval might be named by me for the purpose; I was accordingly requested to communicate on the subject with the city inspectors, Messrs. McDermott, Coyle, and O'Galligan, as also with the manager of such schools as we might think in want of organisers, and furnish a list of such schools to the office." Same post that I received this letter (20/1/57), I informed the secretaries that the duties of the examination of the teachers would engage me until about 10th February, after which I would enter upon the business of the organisation of the city schools. My engagements connected with the examinations occupied me up to 14th February, and it was only on 23d February that I was able to enter upon the visitation of the south city schools. That week, containing two semi-holidays, I visited 18 National Schools, working on Saturday. Those on the north, or my own side, I did not require to visit as I had already inspected every one of them, and proposed some of them for organisation.

I may here remark that an order made (13/2/57), and communicated to me in secretaries' letter of 17th February, assigned the South City District to Dr. Newell, and this alone would free me from all further responsibility in the matter, as Dr. Newell was to permanently enter on his new charge 1st March.

Not so, however; I felt that on many grounds I could do for the new scheme of organisation in Dublin material service. I deemed it a boon sadly wanted, and although Dr. Newell arrived in Dublin on the 3d March to enter on his new duties, I continued to labour in his district during March and April, until the organisation was fully, finally, and cordially accepted in Dublin. March 3d, a letter was sent to me calling on me to furnish the list of schools referred to in the extract already quoted from secretaries' letter of 19th January, and as I have never given such a list * this is referred to in the memorandum of 27th July as one of the instances of habitual neglect which needed explanation. In my reply thereto, I stated, "The third letter" (as to list of schools) "should not have been quoted as in arrear. My whole occupation, which you were well aware of, for the month of March is the reply to it, the introduction of the organisation into the Dublin schools, in the face of many obstacles." Suggestive as I deemed this, it appears that it wholly fails to be a satisfactory answer; but instead, I am charged, in connexion therewith, as having by my neglect,—

1. Caused the organisers to be idle for nearly a fortnight in Dublin, no schools being ready for them.

2. Caused

* The organisers were under the personal direction of the inspectors, more especially under mine, and we sent them where required, so that lists of the schools were wholly unnecessary. The depôt deliveries of apparatus daily showed the schools being organised.

2. Caused them to be expelled from schools because the managers had not been consulted or made aware of the scheme, before the organisers were sent to work.

3. Caused the whole scheme to be put in peril, and the Resident Commissioner, doubtless without his knowledge, is appealed to as evidence that I was well nigh shipwrecking the entire scheme, owing to my neglect.

The Commissioners will, I trust, make due allowance for the natural indignation which an honest and earnest, and old public servant must feel at such a charge, unsupported by a particle of material truth, being brought against him, and I hope to satisfy them that a more unfounded and ungrateful charge, if public servants may reckon on gratitude, could scarcely be conceived.

As to the alleged fortnight's idleness, I beg leave to annex, in disproof, the copy of the journal of the ablest of the organisers, Mr. Joyce, to show you that the organisers arrived in Dublin, from Belfast, on Saturday, 28th February, that their schools were told off to them on Saturday, 7th March, and that they were working in them on Monday, 9th. The occupation of the organisers was ample and necessary the first week.* The circumstances of Belfast and Dublin are widely different; the organisers are of different religions, and there were sufficient schools under the management of different creeds in Belfast, whereas of ordinary national schools in Dublin, I know of one only not under Roman Catholic direction. When a single individual opposed, or was indifferent to the organisation in Dublin, the scheme came to all but a dead lock. This I foresaw, and I objected to sending or permitting these officers to go to the schools, until we should have an opportunity of speaking with them on the line of conduct they should adopt, and of feeling our way in a new and critical undertaking. So far as the north side of the city was concerned I had employment on Monday morning, 2d March, for my share of the organisers, and also for a fair share of them on the south, as by Monday I had visited 24 schools and met the most influential of the managers on Dr. Newell's side of the city.

I had spoken over the scheme with Mr. Coyle, again and again, and we were of one mind regarding it, and on Monday, 2d, I called on Mr. M'Dermott to meet us. Mr. O'Galligan had no connexion with any schools in or near the city, and next day we spent over three hours in conference upon the schools to be organised, and in reference to the general question. Wednesday, 4th, Dr. Newell, Mr. Keenan, and myself, spent the chief part of the day in connexion with the subject, and every day of this week I was engaged for some time with the Resident Commissioner in consultation upon the measure. Thursday, 5th, Dr. Newell, Mr. Keenan, Mr. M'Dermott, Mr. Coyle and I, spent hours in considering the question; and after mature deliberation, and finding that the great body of the city teachers were adverse to the scheme, we decided, with the approbation of the Resident Commissioner, not to send out the organisers to the schools until Monday, 9th; meantime, to call in the teachers, and explain the nature, objects, and advantages of the measure to them. I beg leave to submit a copy of the lithographed circular, drawn up by me, and approved of by the Resident Commissioner, which was issued to the managers of schools on Thursday, 5th March. On this day, I called on the managers of 11 National Schools; Friday, the 6th, I was engaged chiefly in making out notes for next day's instruction, and in conference with Mr. Coyle as to some clergymen upon whom he should call. Saturday, 7th, instructed 66 teachers as to organisation of schools; besides these all the organisers were present, and Messrs. Newall, Keenan, Hunter, M'Dermott, Coyle, O'Galligan, Barrett, Sheehy, O'Sullivan, &c. Thus was the first week spent, and that evening the organisers were all allotted to their several schools for duty on Monday, 9th.

The second charge is, that the organisers were expelled from schools because the managers had not been consulted, or made aware of the scheme before the organisers were sent to work. So far as I know, this is simply untrue. I have never

* Five of the fifteen officers had their families in Dublin, and as they had been absent from them for six weeks, some of them begged to be excused from active duty, and all of them had reports, &c. to make out. (*See* Mr. Joyce's Diary respecting their previous week in Belfast.)

never been a party to the sending of any organiser to enter on duty in a school without first obtaining the cordial approval of the manager. The officers were excluded the schools, or rather checked in their work in them, but in no instance until after the managers had changed their minds upon the subject. In truth, the Catholic clergy had a meeting on Friday, 6th March, and His Grace Archbishop Cullen having spoken mistrustingly of the scheme of organisation, the Roman-catholic clergy, were almost who had previously approved of it, withdrew their consent to the measure.

The third charge of peril and shipwreck, owing to alleged neglect on my part, is so utterly contrary to the fact, that it requires unusual command of temper to reply to such a statement. The Roman-catholic Archbishop had checkmated the whole proceeding; although he is not the official manager of any National School, I felt it my duty, in company with Mr. Coyle, to wait on His Grace, and I succeeded in obtaining a withdrawal of his prohibition. His two vicars, his dean, all the managers of the schools to be organised in and near Dublin (save one or two), were waited on by me; managers of over 60 National Schools. In no single instance did I fail in enlisting them in favour of the scheme whenever I met them, and with scarcely an exception I met them all. The Resident Commissioner is appealed to for evidence as to what he knows, and he will state this charge to be utterly unfounded. He will state, that during the whole period of the organisation he had seen on my part a devotion to its success which none could exceed; that not merely the five days of the official week, but also Saturday, for eight weeks, was devoted to the interests of the organisation; that when nearly all despaired of its acceptance in Dublin, and even when it was proposed to stop the work, and send back the whole staff to the north; when such men as the Very Reverend Dr. Yore, Archdeacon Hamilton, &c. had withdrawn their promised support, the Resident Commissioner will, I have no doubt, tell that the task of removing misapprehension and of reassuring the public mind was voluntarily undertaken by me. The disaffection first openly appeared on Saturday evening, 7th, and to arrest it at once, Mr. Coyle and I spent from an early hour on Sunday, 8th, in conference with two influential clergymen, managers of six National Schools, through whom we were enabled to effect much good. That same day (Sunday) Mr. Coyle and I waited on the Resident Commissioner, to communicate to him the result of our mission. Next day we had the honour of an interview with his Grace Archbishop Cullen, and we succeeded in removing from his mind the objections which he had expressed to his clergy against the measure. It was this which secured for the organisation the successful results which have attended it in Dublin. Same day I called on the managers of 20 schools, and to introduce the organisers to them, where employed. Thus from day to day was I employed, and whenever any symptom of misapprehension or indifference presented itself north or south of the city, week day or Sunday, I at once addressed myself to its removal. Thus, Sunday, 22d March, I was engaged seven hours in calling on the clergymen on the south side of the city. I instructed the teachers myself, sometimes to the number of 60 or 70; in the evenings I attended the lectures and classes under the organisers. At my suggestion his Excellency the Earl of Carlisle attended to hear this important part of the scheme, and his visitation of the great majority of the City Schools, undertaken at my suggestion, not merely gave *éclat* to the measure, but it has done vast service to the best interests of national education in Dublin.

The City Schools, that were a notorious disgrace as a class to the national system, are now, at least on the north side, tolerably respectable, and several of them likely to become efficient in the highest degree. In securing this great end I was cordially seconded and ably assisted by Mr. Coyle, whose personal influence with the managers rendered important service during the period of our labours.

Under my direction, and with the approbation of his Grace the most Rev. Archbishop Dixon, about 30 schools in and round Drogheda are being similarly improved by Mr. Joyce, and I there also secured the cordial support and co-operation of the managers in favour of the measure.

I trust the Commissioners will kindly excuse this otherwise ostentatious statement of my share in the work of organisation. To borrow the ideas of the charge

charge against me, I have shown, that instead of having wellnigh shipwrecked the bark of organisation, I was "the pilot who weathered the storm," in the Dublin Channel at least, and landed her useful cargo in every little bay round the coast, even where the native chiefs had deemed her flag alien and her cargo drugged.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries, Education Office.

Dear Sir, 108, Amiens-street, 19 September 1857.

I BEG to forward you, in compliance with your request, the following extract from my diary for last February:

Thursday, 26th February 1857. Last day in Chapel-lane National School, Belfast.

Friday, 27th. Writing reports, five hours; conference with Mr. Keenan, two hours 45 minutes.

Saturday, 28th. Travelling from Belfast to Dublin.

For the next week, ending 7th March, I kept no regular diary, as I was not employed in organising; I was, however, closely engaged at home writing reports, and I went several times to Marlborough-street on business relative to my future destination. On Saturday, the 7th, there was a meeting of the teachers of the city and vicinity; on this day all the organisers attended, and were apportioned to their respective schools. My diary resumes.

Monday, March the 9th. Commenced the organisation of St. Peter's National School, Phibsboro; took materials for reports; saw manager, &c. &c.

I have, &c.
(signed) *P. W. Joyce*, Organiser.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.,
Head Inspector.

Reverend Sir, Education Office, 5 March 1857.

THE Commissioners of National Education having decided upon affording the benefits of organisation to such of the national schools in and near Dublin, the managers of which desire it, we beg leave to inform you, that the nature, objects, and advantages of the proposed scheme will be explained to the teachers of this district on Saturday next, the 7th instant,* at the hour of two o'clock, in the Central Model Schools at Marlborough-street; and we have to request that you will be pleased to direct the teachers, male and female, of the national schools under your control to attend on the occasion.

We hope to be able to wait on you on an early day to explain the details of the scheme, with a view to obtain your support and co-operation in extending it in your schools.

We are, &c.
(signed) Inspectors.

(No. 3.)

MEMORANDUM on Mr. *Kavanagh*'s Letter of 5th October 1857.

THE terms of the order of the Board communicated to Mr. Kavanagh on the 27th July were, that he should Page 1.

"Furnish an explanation respecting *each* item in the statement," prepared by the inspection department, and a copy of which was then enclosed to him.

The order contained nothing calculated to convey the impression that a general explanation was the one required, or that the explanation was to be confined to the journals and letters then in arrear.

On the contrary, particular care was taken to guard against this by the terms made use of in writing to head inspector, and by underlining the word *each* (item).

Mr. Kavanagh in reality admits that he did not comply with the instructions given

* Before this date I had waited on the managers of 50 national schools to explain the scheme to them, and during the organisation I visited the managers of 76 national schools; 34 on the south, and 42 on the north side of the city. *J. W. K.*

given to him, for on ascertaining that his omission to do so had been noticed, he then hastened to go into details. (*See* letter, 5th October.)

Pages 2, 3. The purport of the explanation here given is clearly this :

That the only use of the journals which a head inspector furnishes is to put the office in possession of his address, perhaps the very least of the many objects which the document is intended to serve. For even were his daily address never known to the office, communications could always reach him by being addressed to his official centre, whence it is to be presumed they would be at once transmitted. But Mr. Kavanagh seems to forget that the journal is intended to show the Board the nature and amount of public business performed by the head inspector from day to day, and that his omission to furnish it (even were his address known to the office) leaves the Commissioners in ignorance of the occupation of his time during the period of its detention, and when that extends, as has been the case here, to three, four, and even seven weeks, much inconvenience is experienced.

Assuming, as he states, that during those weeks for which he omitted o tforward journals, the duties on which he was engaged were nevertheless known to the office (of course that could be only in a general, indirect, or accidental way), it would be absurd to suppose that such information is official, could be laid before the Commissioners, or could meet with official action, in case such should be deemed necessary.

Reports. But what about his reports? The course is not to forward these before the journals, consequently when the latter are delayed, say for a month, the former are also delayed. The defects in the schools, requiring recognition on the part of the office, are allowed to remain in existence for a month or two months, as the case may be, because the head inspector will not send forward his reports.

Page 3. On page 3 Mr. Kavanagh observes that the delay in the journals has never been objected to on a financial head, containing, as they do, a record of his personal and travelling expenses, because "such causes a delay in the payment of our accounts."

But this is irrelevant. No one is more fully aware than Mr. Kavanagh that the finance committee pass the account of his expenses only once a month, and consequently that no delay whatever takes place in passing his accounts, from the fact of his holding over the journals until the close of the month, and he must know that he has so kept his journals over until the very day before the sitting of the finance committee, and that he has himself come to the office to see that they are sent forward to committee, and when his reports were not all up, to use his influence to have the journals sent on by promising to clear off the arrears in the reports by a certain day.

Page 6. The only reason for making a comparison between the relative degrees of punctuality that attended the transmission of the journals of Messrs. Kavanagh, Newell, and Hunter was that those journals, and those only, were ever received by the writer of that part of the memorandum in which the comparison was instituted. The idea of evading a comparison between Mr. K. and other head inspectors, because such might prove favourable to the former, never entered the writer's mind.

Page 7. The observation as to the regularity that has attended the transmission of his journals since July last shows that it is a mere fear of consequences that induces him to become regular, as all the letters and warnings that were written from time to time by the secretaries had no effect upon his practice in this respect.

It likewise shows that his former assertion, to the effect that it would be impossible to comply with the office regulations on this point, is incorrect. The punctuality of other head inspectors, as also of the great majority of the district inspectors, conclusively proves it to be so.

Pages 4 to 6. As to the long detail of particulars entered into by Mr. Kavanagh with a view of showing that for a series of Saturdays he was so occupied with other duties of a miscellaneous kind that he could not find time to write out his weekly journals so as to have them forwarded punctually to the office, two simple remarks may be made.

1st. That complaint was made of Mr. Kavanagh in regard to his journals, not because these documents failed to reach the office with punctuality each successive Monday morning, but because they failed often to do so for weeks.

2d. That the district inspectors are regularly, and throughout the entire year, obliged to discharge most weighty and important duties on the Satur-

day, and yet they are required, and of the great majority it is not required in vain, to send in their journals to the office punctually every Monday morning.

And surely what the district inspectors are required to do, and the majority of them regularly and most punctually, in fact, do, it is not too much to expect from the head inspectors, their superiors, and who, as the superintendents of the first, ought pre-eminently to be examples in themselves of official exactness and despatch.

A copy of the letter referred to by Mr. Kavanagh is annexed, and from its perusal it will be seen that it was meant to account for his delay in forwarding his annual reports for publication, and that it is only incidentally he alludes to the work of organisation, and then simply as one of the hindrances to his devoting himself sooner than the 1st of March to the work of preparing those reports. Page 9.

Gentlemen, Grenville, Rathgar, 20 January 1857.

In reply to your circular respecting the reports which I intend for publication in the proceedings of the Commissioners for 1856, I beg leave to inform you that I hope to be able to submit the following :—

1. Report on Trim District Model Schools.
2. ,, Bailieboro' ,,
3. ,, Schools (Ordinary) examined.
4. ,, Examination of Male and Female Teachers.
5. ,, Examination on Common Things.

The examination of teachers, and the writing connected therewith, will engage me until about the 10th proximo. Provision must be made by the head inspectors for drawing up examination papers in time for the examinations at Easter; and further, I am instructed to enter on duty in reference to the city schools, which should be done next month, so that it is clearly out of my power to enter on the drawing up of any of these documents until or after March 1st. I do not think I would be able to have them in the office before the 15th of April at the earliest date.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

To the Secretaries, Education Office.

From the foregoing letter it is plain Mr. Kavanagh contemplated entering on the work of preparing for the organisation of the city schools about the middle of February, and completing such preparation before the 1st of March so as to be then free to devote himself to his annual reports; but did he so enter upon the work?

The following is the answer :—

On the 10th February Mr. Kavanagh is in Dublin, and on the 12th, 13th, and 14th, as appears from his journals, he reports himself occupied not with the work of organisation, but with business of a miscellaneous kind of by no means such urgency or importance as to entitle it to such precedence.

On the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th, Mr. Kavanagh reports himself as engaged, not on organisation, but on making out what he calls "a summary of the examinations of teachers since 1848, and of paid monitors for 1856, with a view to a general report;" work so far from being urgent, that it was not even called for, and what is more, and very noteworthy, the results of such work have never yet been produced by Mr. Kavanagh :—

Sir, Education Office, 2 February 1857.

With reference to your letter of the 20th ultimo, we are to inform you that under the circumstances you mention the reports which you contemplate sending in on the Trim and Bailieboro' District Model Schools, ordinary schools, &c., will not be required for publication.

You are requested, however, to furnish them so soon as you possibly can after the 1st of March next for the information of the Board.

We are, &c.,
(signed) *M. Cross,* } Secretaries.
J. Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

The 20th and 21st of same month of February Mr. Kavanagh devotes himself to examining Mr. Coyle's official books and to correspondence; the business of organisation still in abeyance.

And it is only in journal of prospective arrangements, and for week commencing the 22d of February, that the first mention of entering on the business of organisation is made, and yet in the subsequent journal of the actual work done in that same week, it appears that Mr. Kavanagh went to Tullamore on the 24th, and on the 25th visited the Phillipstown Convict Prison, thus abstracting two days from the business that should have occupied him, and devoting them to work, not only not urgent, but not required of him by the Board, and, so far as the Board is concerned, non-official, Tullamore lying, in fact, outside his district, and the Phillipstown Convict Prison being an institution beyond the sphere of his official inspection.

Page 9. The remark at page 9 is not warranted. Dr. Newell was not intended to supersede Mr. Kavanagh in the work of organisation in any part of the Dublin districts for the month of March. It was meant from the first to intrust it, as senior head inspector, to Mr. Kavanagh solely, the district inspectors of course aiding him; and it was only when it was seen he had not made due preparation, and to save the whole affair from failure, that the thought of calling in Dr. Newell arose.

And here it may be right to observe that besides other inconveniences resulting from Mr. Kavanagh's neglect of the instructions of the 19th of January, the time of Dr. Newell and Mr. Keenan, not to speak of the district inspectors, was materially trenched upon.

At page 10, Mr. Kavanagh, while purporting to quote the office memorandum, commits the very serious fault of misrepresenting it by giving as one of its charges a statement not to be found in it at all; the passage here referred to is that numbered 2 at foot, namely, that by his neglect he "caused" them (that is, the organisers) "to be expelled from schools, because," &c.

And yet, strange as it may seem, this might have been included with propriety and truth among the consequences attributed to Mr. Kavanagh's delay (*see* his letter, page 13, third line from bottom).

As to the two charges which are contained in office memorandum, and both of which Mr. Kavanagh endeavours to refute, the chief of the inspection department, under whose eye that memorandum was drawn up, now reiterates them with the most perfect confidence of their substantial truth.

The first, that the organisers, having no preparation made for them, were kept idle* in the city here for nearly a fortnight, is fully borne out by the journals of the organisers themselves for the month of March, now in the office. Some, it appears from these, went to work on the 9th, some on the 10th, and some, not fairly, until the 11th and 12th of March.

The second, that owing to Mr. Kavanagh's neglect the whole thing had nearly been ruined just at its start is proved beyond question, if proof were wanted, by the facts detailed in Mr. Kavanagh's own letter, pages 14 and 15.

Mr. Kavanagh's style of defence is like that of a sea captain who, on being charged with mismanagement and neglect in allowing his ship to be stranded, should plead his after exertions in getting her off; how he roused the crew to their duty and nerved them by his example, and how, inspiring them with his own energy for a last great effort, he at length succeeded in getting her again afloat! all very well if merely meant as a pleading in extenuation of the first fault; but if otherwise, if intended as a justification and defence, the answer would be, All very fine, but beside the question, for the charge was not that there was a lack of courage in the hour of danger, or failure of exertion to get out of it, but that, through disregard of the ordinary precautions, and want of seamanlike handling, the danger was ever incurred and the ship stranded at all.

The narration given by Mr. Kavanagh himself of what he did in March to gain acceptance for the system of organisation, how he appeased the jealousies of some and quieted the fears of others; how he disarmed prejudice and removed misapprehension, is clearly the strongest condemnation of the course pursued by him in February. For if he so well succeeded in dispelling suspicions from the minds of managers in March, what success would he not have had with these same managers, if he had sought their co-operation before such such suspicions were

* Of course meant as to organisation itself.

were excited. To allay a storm when raised argues the power of keeping it down; for surely to restrain the winds from breaking out would seem a less task than to recall them, once fairly broken loose.

Indeed, it is very plain on review of this whole case, that had Mr. Kavanagh acted on the instructions of the letter of the 19th January, either by himself going round the city schools and their managers early in February, or directing Messrs. Coyle, M'Dermott, and O'Galligan, to do so, one of two things would have happened; either, first, that the city managers, all misconception anticipated and removed by timely explanations, would have been fully prepared cordially to accept of the services of the organisers on their arrival from Belfast, in which case all would have gone on smoothly, and there would have been no need of delay; or, secondly, the Board, timely apprised of the threatened opposition, would have been able to countermand their order for the return of these officers to the city, and to send them elsewhere, and thus have saved the system from being, as Mr. Kavanagh phrases it, "checkmated" by the Roman-catholic Archbishop, Doctor Cullen.

The value of what Mr. Kavanagh says as to the necessity of preparing the organisers on their return from Belfast for their duties in Dublin may be judged of by this: first, that these officers had spent no less time than the previous five months, during nearly four of which they were in Dublin under the special training of Mr. Keenan, who was charged with the task of fitting them for those very duties; and, second, that though they have since been dispersed to all parts of Ireland, no further special preparations, no new instructions have been found necessary for their guidance, but they have everywhere and at once gone to their work of organisation, and without, it would appear, exciting any jealousies or fears among managers or patrons.

In conclusion, it will be seen on examination of his letter Mr. Kavanagh fails altogether to give anything like a satisfactory answer to the charge that he neglected to advise the city inspectors, Messrs. M'Dermott, Coyle, and O'Galligan, of the instructions of the secretaries' letter of the 19th of January. That he did so neglect to advise those gentlemen is certain. At the time of the great commotion created in the beginning of March by the threatened opposition of the Roman-catholic city clergy, Mr. M'Dermott, Mr. Coyle, and Mr. O'Galligan, when spoken to upon the subject here in the office, assured the chief of the Inspection Department that Mr. Kavanagh had never given them any previous instructions as to their making preparations for the employment of the organisers on their return from Belfast, and the journals of all three for months of January and February, completely bear out this, there not being a word about organisation from any one of them until the month of March.

Inspection Department, 10 November 1857.

No. 1. (I.)

CORRESPONDENCE between the Commissioners of National Education, *Ireland*, and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools), relative to a Paper read by him before the "British Association," on the "Rise, Progress, and present Prospects of Popular Education in *Ireland*;" together with a Letter from *R. Sullivan*, LL.D., &c., from 17th August to 13th November 1857.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 17 August 1857.

I BEG leave to apply for leave of absence from duty on the week commencing Thursday, 27th instant.

Having been honoured by a place on the committee of one of the sections (F. Economic Science and Statistics) of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, I am anxious, during the approaching meeting of that distinguished body, to assist in the duties of the committee upon which I have been placed.

For the last 10½ years I have not been absent from business over seven or eight weeks in the aggregate, and even during the brief periods when I have taken vacation, it has been chiefly, as on the present occasion, in connexion with inquiries more or less bearing upon my duties in relation to popular education.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries,
Education Office.

Sir, Education Office, 19 August 1857.

In answer to your letter of the 17th instant, we have to inform you that leave of absence from duty for the week commencing Thursday, the 27th instant, is granted to you.

We are, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross,* *J. Kelly,* } Secretaries.

James W. Kavanagh, Esq.
Head Inspector, Rathgar.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 10 September 1857.

At the earliest moment after I have obtained it from the public press, to whom it was handed by the officers of Section F. British Association, I beg leave to submit for perusal the paper read by me before the British Association on Monday, 1st instant, entitled, "The Rise, Progress, and present Prospects of Popular Education in Ireland."

As the manuscript is not now my property, but belongs to the British Association, in whose proceedings for this year the paper will appear, I shall call for it early next week. My object in sending it, instead of a copy of it, was that you might see the very paper which I read, in order to remove all misapprehension as to its precise nature and statements.

The facts, extracts, and statistics of education previous to 1831, are almost taken exclusively from the Board's Reports, and nearly all the rest of the matter of the paper has been again and again set forth by me in reports, letters, &c.

Extracts from, or notices of it, have appeared in nearly all the Irish, and in some of the English papers, and all, with three exceptions, have favourably alluded to it: the "Warder" and the "Daily Express," from their principles, and a northern paper, from misapprehension, the latter referring to it statements the very opposite to those contained in it.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries,
Education Office.

P.S.—I have marked a few words inserted after the reading of the paper; with these exceptions, I read every word in the paper to the meeting.

J. W. K.

Popular Education in Ireland.

Sketch of its Rise, Progress, and present Prospects; being a Paper read before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at its Twenty-seventh Meeting, Dublin, September 1st, 1857; with Notes and Appendix. By James W. Kavanagh, Esq., Head Inspector of National Schools, Member of the General Committee of the British Association, Member of the Statistical and of the Geological Societies of Dublin, &c. &c.

Twenty-seventh Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, *Dublin*, 1857.

President:—Rev. Humphrey Lloyd, D.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.S.L. and E., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.

General Secretary:—Major-General Edward Sabine, R.A., D.C.L., Treasurer, and V.P.R.S., F.R.A.S.

Assistant

Assistant General Secretary :—John Philips, A.M., F.R.S., F.G.S., Reader in Geology, University of Oxford.

Local Secretaries :—Lundy E. Foote, V.P., R.D.S.; Rev. Professor Jellett, Royal Irish Academy; W. Neilson Hancock, LL.D., Secretary, Statistical Society, Dublin.

SECTION F.—*Economic Science and Statistics.*

President :—The Archbishop of Dublin.

Vice-Presidents :—The Right Honourable Baron Monteagle, A.M., F.R.S., F.S.A.; Edwin Chadwick, C.B., London; M. D. Hill, Q.C., Recorder of Birmingham; James A. Lawson, Q.C., LL.D.; Edward Baines, Geological Society, Yorkshire, Leeds; John Strang, LL.D, Glasgow; William Donnelly, LL.D., C.B., Registrar-General; F. G. P. Neison, Statistical Society, London; James R. Napier, Glasgow Philosophical Society.

Secretaries :—William Newmarch, Statistical Society, London; J. E. Cairnes, A.M., Professor of Political Economy, T.C.D.; Henry Dix Hutton, LL.B., Secretary, Statistical Society, Dublin.

Committee :—E. Barrington, Statistical Society, Dublin; Richard Barrington, Statistical Society, Dublin; the Right Honourable the Lord Chief Baron Pigot; W. Bottomley, Belfast; Robert Chambers, F.R.S., Edinburgh; John Crawfurd; W. Neilson Hancock, LL.D., Statistical Society, Dublin; E. Halsall, Bristol; James Haughton, Statistical Society, Dublin; Professor Ingram, LL.D., F.T.C.D.; Lucien Jottrand, Delegate of the International Free Trade Association, Brussels; James W. Kavanagh, Head Inspector of National Schools, Statistical and Geological Societies, Dublin; Lieutenant-Colonel Larcom, R.E., LL.D., Vice-President, Dublin Statistical Society, Under Secretary for Ireland; Professor Laycock, M.D., University of Edinburgh; John Lentaigne, M.D., Director of Convicts' Prisons; T. E. C. Leslie, LL.B., Professor Political Economy, Queen's College, Belfast; Corr Vander Maeren, Delegate and President of the International Free Trade Association (Central Committee), Brussels; J. J. Murphy, Belfast; W. Murray, F.R.S.E., Scotland; John O'Hagan, A.B., Professor Political Economy, Catholic University; W. Pare, Statistical Society, Dublin; J. Perry, Statistical Society, Dublin; J. Pim, Vice-President, Statistical Society, Dublin; the Lord Provost of Glasgow; J. Shuttleworth, Stamp Office, Manchester; J. M. Wilson, Statistical Society, Dublin; James Yates, F.R.S., London.

Amongst the crowded and distinguished audience present in this section on Tuesday, September 1st, were his Excellency the Earl of Carlisle, K.G., Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, attended by his staff; his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin, President; Earl of Massareene and Ferrard, K.S.P.; the Right Honourable Lord Monteagle; the Right Honourable the Lord Justice (Blackburne) of Appeal; the Right Honourable Baron Greene; the Lord Bishop of Cork; Right Honourable J. Napier, Q.C., M.P.; James Whiteside, Q.C., M.P.; Lieutenant-Colonel Larcom; Edwin Chadwick, C.B.; James A. Lawson, Q.C., LL.D.; Robert Chambers, F.R.S.E.; Lieutenant-Colonel Beamish, K.H., F.R.S., Cork; C. Vander Maeren; Dr. Strang; Rev. Dr. Graves, F.T.C.D.; Dr. Hancock; Professors Leslie, Jellett, Evelyn, Thomson; Rev. Thomas Marshall, Castlejordan; Dr. Harrison; Captain Crofton, C.B., Director of Convicts' Prisons; Sir A. Orr, Lord Provost, Glasgow; Professor Ingram, LL.D., F.T.C.D.; E. Baines, Leeds; C. Bianconi; W. Donnelly, C.B., Registrar-General; Archdeacon West; Professor Cairnes, T.C.D.; Dr. Gray, "Freeman's Journal;" Dowden Richard; Dr. Hutton; Newmarch, Jemison, Neison, Murphy, Pare; James Haughton; J. Perry; Dr. Nachot, Edinburgh; Rev. Mr. Godkin, "Daily Express;" Very Rev. Deans Tighe and Bagot; Carpenter; J. O'Hagan; J. R. Napier, Glasgow; James Macdonnell; Dr. Fitzpatrick; Maurice Cross, Secretary to the Commissioners of National Education; Dr. Newell, Head Inspector of National Schools; E. Sheehy, Professor National Board; S. Adair, Inspector National Schools; Dr. Kirkpatrick, Inspector of Agricultural National Schools; —— Moore; P. Gale; B. Kelly, &c.

During the temporary absence of his Grace the President, the chair was taken by Edwin Chadwick, Esq., C.B., Vice-President.

Mr. Kavanagh read as follows:—

The British Association for the Advancement of Science and the National System of Education in Ireland,* were originated and brought into active operation the same year; and, honoured as we are with the presence of that distinguished body in the Irish metropolis, I deemed it a favourable occasion to submit, through this section of our association, a brief sketch of the rise, progress, and present prospects of popular education in Ireland, but more especially in reference to the national system, which is now just completing the twenty-sixth year of its existence.

In

* In the letter of the Right Hon. E. G. Stanley—the charter of the national system—there is nothing whatsoever to warrant the statement that it was not intended as a national system for the people of Ireland; mainly however for the lower classes, but not for the poor alone. This addition "for the poor of Ireland" was maintained in the Reports of the Board up to 1839, when it was changed to "Commissioners of National Education," and was revived again in 1845, when the Charter of Incorporation once referred to it; but, except in that document, it has never since been officially quoted. The Poor Law Act of 1840 brought tens of thousands of pupils into nominal connexion with the national system, and for thirteen or fourteen years increased the seeming strength of its numbers; but my General Report of 1853 on Workhouse Schools (Commissioners' Report, 1853) shows the precise extent of the advantages which the pauper children derived from that connexion.

In laying before the meeting this sketch, it will be alike my wish as my duty, to avoid trenching upon any ground which might lead to controversy unsuited to the broad and common platform upon which we meet; and to confine myself within those limits of the question which my official position under the national system permits me to discuss, and in which alone the economic and statistical section of the British Association can feel more immediately interested.

The diffusion, through the lower classes of society, of the mere arts of reading, writing, and counting, is a creation of almost our own age in Ireland. And in order to clearly understand its present position, it is necessary that I should submit a brief account of the several bodies that had been entrusted by Parliament with the duty of educating the people.

In 1733, the Incorporated Society for promoting English Protestant schools in Ireland was founded by Royal Charter, and their schools, called Charter Schools, were aided by Parliamentary Grants up to 1825, when, on a Report of the Education Commission of 1824, the grants were withdrawn. In 1824, the number of schools was 32, of pupils, 2,255, and amount of grant, 21,615 *l.*

The Association for Discountenancing Vice was founded in 1793, and incorporated in 1800, and their schools received public grants for many years. It required that the teachers should be of the Established Church, that the Scriptures be read by all who were able, and that no Catechism be taught except that of the Established Church. The number of schools in 1824 was 226, and pupils, 12,769, of whom 4,804 were Roman-catholics; grant from the the public, 7,106 *l.*

The governors of the Foundling Hospital were incorporated in 1772; the Blue Coat Hospital Schools were founded in 1773; and the London Hibernian School Society in 1805. The two former institutions received annual grants from Parliament, but the latter was supported by voluntary subscriptions.

In 1806 a Royal Commission was appointed "To inquire into the several funds and revenues granted by public or private donations for the purposes of education, and into the state and condition of all schools upon public or charitable foundation in Ireland." This body continued its inquiries up to 1812, when they submitted their Report to his Grace the Duke of Richmond, then Lord Lieutenant; and which embodies the first attempt to frame "a system which, whilst it shall afford the opportunities of education to every description of the lower classes of the people, may at the same time, by keeping clear of all interference with the peculiar religious tenets of any, induce the whole to receive its benefits, as one undivided body, under the one and the same system, and in the same establishments." These eight Royal Commissioners were members of the Established Church; two archbishops, one bishop, the provost of Trinity College, Richard Lovell Edgeworth, and three other laymen; and their Report first distinctly sets forth a general, indeed the present, plan of National Education, as promulgated 19 years after, in the letter of the Right Hon. E. G. Stanley, now Earl of Derby. That Report does justice to the strong desire for instruction prevailing universally amongst the poor; and thereupon the Commissioners "indulge the more confident expectation that if such a plan as that proposed be frankly offered to the people, it would be cordially accepted, provided all interference with the particular religious tenets of those who are to receive that instruction shall, in the first instance, be unequivocally disclaimed, and effectually guarded against. The Commissioners further express their unanimous opinion that no such plan, however wisely and unexceptionably contrived in other respects, can be carried into effectual execution in this country, unless it be explicitly avowed, and clearly understood as its leading principle, that no attempt shall be made to influence or disturb the peculiar religious tenets of any sect or description of Christians."

The Commissioners, in their Report of 1812, state that the 33 endowed classical schools of Ireland had then 1,000 pupils; 44 public establishments for the education of the lower classes, lodged, maintained, and clothed 4,200 scholars; and exclusive of these, there were 4,600 schools, containing over 200,000 children. The proportion of Protestant children was 28 $\frac{3}{4}$, and of Roman-catholics 71 $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. Now, as the census of the previous year (1811) returned 394,813 children as in actual attendance in the public schools of the country, it is quite clear that either the estimate of the Commissioners of Inquiry, in 1812, must be much below the truth, or the census return of 1811 must be above it.

In December 1811, a voluntary institution was formed in Dublin, called the Society for the Education of the Poor of Ireland,* and afterwards the Kildare-place Society, whose principles were stated to be "the admission of pupils, uninfluenced by religious distinctions, and the reading of the Bible or Testament, without note or comment, by all the pupils who had attained a suitable proficiency, excluding catechisms and controversial treatises; the Bible or Testament not to be used as a class-book, from which children should be taught to read or spell." The society continued to labour, supported by voluntary contributions, from its establishment up to 1814–15, when, on giving a pledge that "no attempt should be made to influence or disturb the peculiar religious tenets of any sect or description of Christians"—the fundamental basis of the Royal Commissioners' Report of 1812—Parliament voted a grant of 6,980 *l.*, Irish currency, to aid its funds. Annual Parliamentary grants continued to be made to the Kildare-place Society from that time up to 1831, when they were discontinued. During the 15 years it received public aid, to the amount of 219,076 *l.*, and in the year 1830, the number of its schools was 1,621, and of pupils, 132,530.

This

* Some benevolent Quakers built a set of large schools in the Liberties of Dublin for the poor children of that populous district in 1790, and their early success led to the formation of this society. For some years past, these schools—in School-street—have been the property of the National Board, and are conducted as auxiliary, or branch, model schools.

This scheme of education could never be popular or national, as it was founded on a principle—compulsion to read the Testament without note or comment—at variance with the opinions of Roman-catholics, who formed the great majority of those for whom the schools were intended. The Roman-catholic body in a little time gave powerful opposition to the working of the society; and in 1824, in consequence of an address from the House of Commons, his Majesty appointed Commissioners to inquire into the nature and extent of the instruction afforded by the different schools in Ireland, supported in whole or in part from the public funds, and to report to his Majesty upon the best means of extending to all classes of the people the benefits of education. The Commissioners were on this occasion five, all laymen; four of the Established Church, one of these being one of the Commissioners of 1806, and one a Roman-catholic, Mr. Blake, subsequently a member of the National Board. The Commission made nine Reports, all in general accordance with those made in 1812, and from which it appeared that so hostile were the Roman-catholics to the scheme of education administered by the Kildare-place Society, that out of 400,348 children whose parents paid for their education in 1824, there were 81,060 Protestants, or only 20 per cent., and 319,288, or 80 per cent., Catholics; whereas, in the schools of the Society, out of 56,201 pupils, 26,237, or 47 per cent., were Protestants, and only 29,964, or 53 per cent., Catholics. These facts established, beyond all doubt, that the Kildare-place scheme had not the confidence of the people, and that the vast majority of the nation, a few years after its public endowment, refused to avail themselves of the education which it offered.

Impatient and dissatisfied, the Commons, in 1828, referred the Reports of both Commissions, that of 1812 and of 1824, to a Committee of the House; and the Report and Resolutions thereon recommend the complete and distinct separation of the literary from the religious education of the scholars; the latter to be not only on days exclusively set apart for the purpose, but different days to be named for Protestants and Catholics; teachers to have no right of interference; and clergymen to be charged with the separate religious instruction of the pupils of their respective communions. The Report states in conclusion: "Your Committee cannot avoid expressing the most earnest hope that if adopted by the House, their recommendation will satisfy moderate and rational men of all opinions. It has been the object of your Committee to discover a mode in which the combined education of Protestant and Catholic might be carried on, resting upon religious instruction, but free from the suspicion of proselytism. Your Committee has endeavoured to avoid any violation of the liberty of conscience, or any demands or sacrifices inconsistent with the religious faith of any denominations of Christians; they propose leaving to the clergy of each persuasion the duty and the privilege of giving religious instruction to those who are committed to their care."

In 1830, the House of Commons again had the question before them, and the Select Committee of that year appointed to examine into the state of the Irish poor, urged in their Report "the hope that no further time will be lost in giving to the public the benefit of the expensive and long-protracted inquiries before the Royal Commissioners of 1806 and 1824, and the practical recommendations of the Select Committee of 1828, the Report of which Committee is ordered to be reprinted."

The result was, that on the 9th September 1831, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, the Right Hon. E. G. Stanley, now Earl of Derby, announced in the House of Commons, the intention of his Majesty's Government to appoint the new Board, and to enter upon the present scheme of National Education in Ireland. Mr. Stanley showed that the Kildare-place Society had entirely failed, from starting on a principle opposed to the vast majority of the nation; that of its 1,621 schools, in 1830, there were 1,021 in the Protestant province of Ulster, and only 600 in the other three provinces; and of 204 teachers trained in 1831, all were Protestants except 33.

This preface was absolutely necessary in order to make clear the 25 years' preparation—1806 to 1831—for the national system, before entering upon the history of its struggles for the last 25 years to attain its present position. The new scheme was founded upon the results of the inquiries of two Royal Commissions, upon the recommendations of two Select Committees of the House of Commons, and upon the utter failure of the Kildare-place system, as a means of national education.

In tendering the Presidency of this new Board to his Grace the Duke of Leinster, the Right Hon. Mr. Stanley, in his letter of October 1831, which is the charter of the present national system, says—"a Committee of the House of Commons to which were referred the various Reports of the Commissioners of Education, recommended a system to be adopted which should afford, if possible, a combined literary, and a separate religious education, and should be capable of being so far adapted to the views of the religious persuasions which divide Ireland, as to render it, in truth, a system of national education for the lower classes of the community. For the success of the undertaking, which must depend upon the character of the individuals who compose the Board, and upon the security thereby afforded to the country, that while the interests of religion are not overlooked, the most scrupulous care should be taken not to interfere with the peculiar tenets of any description of Christian pupils."

Reading, writing, arithmetic, and such general information as might be collected from the elementary class-books, formed the aim and the measure of the Kildare-place Society's schools. Their books were tolerably fair; the discipline, order, and cleanliness in the schools were rather good; their educational statistics and forms were simple and elementary; their furniture, fittings and apparatus, where best provided, were on the model of the Lan-

casterian plan; and, on the whole, their system was excellent, as a first rude attempt to pass from the hedge and the adventure schools to some form of organisation and method.*

When the Roman-catholics began to withdraw connexion from the Kildare-street Schools, a committee was formed by them, called the Catholic Book Society; and under the direction of this body their schools were placed. They published several works, which they sold to the schools at reduced rates, but this formed the chief assistance which they rendered.

On the establishment of the National Board, therefore, numbers of the schools which had been under the Kildare-place Society, and most of the better class of the Catholic schools were at once put in connexion with the new system, so that by the close of 1833, it had 789 schools in operation, with 107,042 pupils on their rolls.

It can readily be understood that for a considerable period the Commissioners were obliged to tolerate many abuses which existed during the earlier period of their labours. Inferior books had to be permitted until better should be written; teachers had to be trained, normal schools to be established, and improved furniture and plans of school organisation devised. There were only four inspectors for the whole island, and instead of being occupied in the superintendence of schools, they were rather engaged in establishing them.†

In 1834, a Commission of Public Instruction was appointed, and from the Second Report of that body it appeared that there were then 443 parishes which had no school whatever, and that there were 5,633 schools for the poor, many of them hedge schools, supported solely by the wretched payments of the pupils. It is unnecessary to describe the condition, moral and intellectual, of such a class of schools.

The new system, in the face of much opposition, continued to extend, and gradually take root in the country. The several stages of its working during the five quinquennial periods of its history may be thus statistically set forth:—

PERIOD.	Number of		Annual Parliamentary Grant.
	Schools.	Pupils.	
			£.
Fifth year, ending Sept. 1836 - - -	1,181	153,707	35,000
Tenth year, „ „ 1841 - - -	2,337	281,849	57,000
Fifteenth year „ „ 1846 - - -	3,637	456,410	100,000
Twentieth year, „ „ 1851 - - -	4,704	520,401	164,577
Twenty-fifth year „ „ 1856 - - -	5,245	560,134	213,030

In the year 1821, the Kildare-place Society had 36,657 pupils in their schools, or one in 211, and in 1831, 137,639 pupils, or one in fifty-six of the general population of Ireland. In 1834, the national schools had one in fifty-four of the whole population in attendance in them; in 1841, they had one in twenty-eight; in 1851, one in twelve; and in 1856, very nearly one in ten. From 1836 to 1856, the number of schools had increased about five-fold, and the number of pupils four-fold nearly; and whereas in 1836, less than one fiftieth of the whole population was in the national schools; in 1856, there was one-tenth, or five-fold increase in the 20 years. We have here before us the unparalelled fact, that although the population has rapidly decreased since 1841, to the estimated extent of 2,971,307, being now only 6,047,492, whereas, at the ordinary rate of increase, it should be 9,526,398,‡ the number of pupils in the national schools has not only not shared in the expected decline, but it has actually doubled in 1856, as compared with 1841.§ The explanation of this remarkable social phenomenon is to be found in three causes—1. The intense love of knowledge, and hatred of illiteracy by the Irish people; 2. The impartiality, upon religious grounds, with which the national schools are conducted;‖ and, 3. The gradual extinction of most of the hedge, private, and adventure schools.

Before entering upon an estimate of the number of pupils of all classes in schools of every

* See Report of the Evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Lords (1854) upon National Education in Ireland—James W. Kavanagh's Evidence, Questions, 2394–2402.

† In 1834, the number was increased to eight; in 1838, to twenty-five; in 1846, to thirty-four; in 1855, to fifty-six; and in 1857, to sixty-six literary inspectors of various grades.

‡ Computed upon the usual annual increase of 1 per cent. (correctly $\frac{1}{107}$th), or the excess of one birth to every thirty-three, above one death to every forty-five, persons living, assuming immigration and emigration to be equal.

§ See Report of Evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Lords, 1854. James W. Kavanagh.—Questions, 2421–2468.

‖ This is true generally, but numerous instances occur of partiality and unfairness in the practical management of schools attended by pupils of two or more religious persuasions. Some of these are designed, others arise from want of vigilance on the part of clergymen, and from the ignorance and neglect of parents, and also from the advantage which may be taken thereof by managers under the rules of the Board.

every description in Ireland, I beg to call the attention of this section of the Association to the necessity for compulsory registration in all schools, private* as well as public, with a view to reliable and uniform educational statistics throughout the empire.

The main data of the problem of popular education lie within three simple, but cardinal facts—1. The average age at which each pupil goes to school; 2. The average age at which he finally leaves, to enter upon the business of life; and 3. The average rate or regularity of his attendance within this school period. Given these, it is the business of the educationist to determine a system of popular education suited to them. Every leading agency in this scheme must subordinate itself to these three facts—the matériel of the school, including its furniture, fittings, and apparatus; the books, the methods, the qualifications of teachers; every aim, physical, moral, and intellectual, in relation to the school, must be directed to the solution of the immediate problem.†

The duty was entrusted to me to devise and draw up a general system of improved school accounts for the Irish National Schools; and these came into operation in the early part of 1856. I beg leave to submit to the section, copies of the three forms—Rolls, daily report book, and register, with instructions for keeping each. These forms are at once clear, simple, and comprehensive; and it is generally admitted, that at the present moment no country in the world should be able to furnish more minute and reliable educational results in relation to nearly 600,000 pupils, than the Irish National Schools, through these new statistical records.

In Great Britain there are numerous forms of accounts used by the different classes of denominational schools aided by the Government, and recent circulars from the Privy Council show that it is only now the subject has attracted due attention. So late as May 1856, Mr. Lingen, their Lordship's able secretary, writes, "My Lords think the form which you recommend highly useful to be kept, but they are obliged to proceed with caution in adding to the heads under which official returns are called for, the subject of school accounts being at present new, and the persons who make them being charged with other onerous duties." The Reports by the Rev. D. J. Stewart, Mr. Stokes, Dr. Cumming, and several others of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, as contained in the Minutes of Council for 1856–7, show the absence and the want of a uniform and reliable system of school registration in Great Britain.

On the whole, we have every reason to be proud of the Irish census of 1851, which reflects such credit on the able and justly-honoured Registrar General who superintended it; the educational portion of it is open to improvement, however, and as I am fully aware that those entrusted with that important duty are ready and anxious to receive friendly suggestions, I shall here advert to a few points which will require attention in the census of 1861. The returns of the number of pupils in all the schools, colleges, and educational establishments in Ireland, are given under 20 different categories, or classes, of schools; thus, National, Church Education, Parochial, Workhouse, Gaol, Free, Industrial, &c., whereas this is what is called by logicians, a cross-division; nearly all the workhouse, some of the gaol, many of the free, and several of the industrial, being also National Schools, and therefore should have been arranged under that generic head. This single vital defect destroys the value of the whole return, so far as it is a classification of schools; it unduly, but unwittingly, cuts off hundreds of thousands of pupils from the National Schools, and, by implication, throws suspicion upon the good faith with which their returns to the public are made. In a similar manner, the census returns of 1851 tend to mislead in giving the number of scholars present in the school during one of the most unfortunately selected weeks in the year, as an index of the entire school-going population of Ireland.‡

Having already pointed out to the section the numerical progress of the pupils in the national schools, I would call attention to the other schools for the humbler classes in Ireland.

The Church Education Society was instituted in 1838, and came into operation in 1839, for the instruction of children of the Church of England, in her catechism, formularies, and principles, and the reading of the Scriptures daily, in the authorised version, by all the pupils who frequent the schools.§ From its annual Reports it would appear that the number of its schools and pupils gradually increased up to 1852, when it had 1,858 schools,

---

* In Germany and Switzerland any one may found a school, provided he complies with the following conditions:—1. It must be open to inspection; 2. Be provided with a play-ground and afford regular exercise twice a day to the pupils; 3. Teach reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, singing, and the rudiments of the physical sciences; 4. Provide sufficient teaching power; 5. Keep the rooms clean, warm, and ventilated; and, 6. Employ none but teachers who hold certificates of health, of competence, and of good character from a recognised normal college or training school.—*Kay*.

† *See* essays and papers read before the Educational Conference of June 1857, in London (lately published), under the presidency of His Royal Highness Prince Albert, especially those by Rev. Mr. Mitchell, Rev. J. P. Norris, and Rev. W. J. Kennedy, Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools; Dr. Matter, Inspecteur-Général et honoraire de l'instruction publique en France; M. Eugène Rendu, Paris; Joseph Kay, Esq.; Captain B. Ibbotson; H. Seymour Tremenheere, Esq.; Rev. C. H. Bromby, &c. See also Irish National School Register, directions for keeping it.

‡ *See* papers read before the Educational Conference of London; Edward Baines, Esq., Leeds, suggesting some cautions in reference to the Educational Census of 1851 in England; Notes, page 168, to a Paper by H. S. Tremenheere, Esq.; and also a paper by W. H. Hyett, Esq., on English Educational Statistics.

§ *See* Reports of Church Education Society; Digest of the Evidence upon National Education before the House of Lords' Committee, 1854, by Rev. W. Trench, D.D., Secretary to the Church Education Society, chap. XVI.; Thom's Almanac, &c.

schools, attended by 105,387 pupils, and supported by voluntary grants to the amount of 40,724*l.*; the subsequent reports, however, exhibit a decrease, thus in 1856, there were 1,769 schools, 85,569 pupils, and an income of 39,527*l.*

Besides the National and the Church Education, there is a considerable number of very large and very numerously attended schools conducted by some of the religious orders of the Roman-catholic Church; thus, the Christian Brothers* have 44 establishments in 30 of the principal towns, attended by 20,000 boys; the Franciscans, 11 large schools in Mayo and Galway, attended by 3,000 boys; and there is a considerable number of schools under Nuns, attended by not less than 20,000 girls.†

Through the country, especially in Connaught, and in the larger towns in all the provinces, there is yet a vast number of very humble and miserably kept private or adventure schools, the pupils in which cannot be less than 30,000 to 40,000.‡

There are also many Protestant parochial, endowed, and other schools, not connected either with the National Board or with the Church Education Society.

We next come to private schools of a more respectable character, either good English and commercial schools, those called seminaries, academies, middle-class, and collegiate schools, which, in addition to English, give instruction in other languages, and prepare boys for colleges and universities; and, lastly, young ladies' day schools for females of a corresponding rank in life.

Boarding schools for both sexes, diocesan, endowed, and Royal schools, Roman-catholic diocesan schools and colleges, the Queen's Colleges, and Trinity College, make up the whole of the general educational establishments of the country, omitting professional institutions.

The following estimate is submitted of the number of persons now under instruction, or attending schools of every kind, in Ireland:—

Elementary:	
National Schools	560,000
Church Education	85,000
Other public schools	80,000
Private schools	75,000
	800,000
Higher schools and colleges and domestic education§	35,000
TOTAL‖	835,000

If this return be not over-estimated, which it cannot be to any material extent, there is nearly fourteen per cent., or one-seventh of the whole population, under instruction, a fact, so far as it goes, of a gratifying character, when we recollect that this is about half the entire population from five to fifteen years of age.¶

I wish I could truthfully stop here at the most favourable point from which to view the educational picture. But now comes the question, what is the nature and extent of the instruction

* *See* Report of the Royal Commissioners of Inquiry into the state of the Endowed Schools in Ireland, as to the high character of these excellent schools, the majority of which I have from time to time visited.

† Another important educational agency—but one almost exclusively religious—is the Sunday School. The Protestant Sunday School Society was founded in 1809, and the numbers of its schools and scholars continued to increase up to 1845, when the former were 2,972, and the latter 246,738; and in 1857, the schools are returned as 2,793, and scholars, 219,329, or upwards of one-fifth of the entire Protestant population. There is no complete return of the Roman-catholic Sunday Schools, but the number and attendance in them must be very considerable.

‡ Many hundreds of these visited by me in all parts of Ireland were most numerously attended; the crowded state of the rooms, the insufficient ventilation, and low sanitary condition of the greater number must render them active agents in propagating disease and increasing mortality amongst the poor.

§ The census tables divide schools into primary and superior; the latter professing to teach a foreign, or second language, and the former English only. The number of both sexes returned in the latter in 1851 was 18,502.

‖ The census of 1851 supplies the following statistics. The heads of 9,508 schools, of all kinds, returned 504,465 as the number of pupils that had actually attended in them for any day of the (badly selected) week (Passion week), ending April 12; and this, it is quite evident, is far below the number of different pupils who had been under instruction in these schools in the course of the year 1851, and much below the number of scholars on the roll, or strength of the schools, for even that week. The family returns give 705,990 as the number of children attending school on Sunday, March 30th—the day fixed by the Act 13 & 14 Vict., c. 44, for taking the census—and the common sense of the people appears to have corrected the sad blunder of the Legislature, as this number is not very much below the truth, when we consider the following—the heading in the family return (Form A., 1st Table): "If a child, whether attending school?"—must have been understood by many as excluding all but mere children; all not attending school, but who were receiving domestic tuition, are likely excluded; those children at that time, or about that period, temporarily absent from school through illness, employment, &c., must also have been omitted; and, doubtless, some may have considered the day as really intended, and meant to apply to Sunday schools. It is to be hoped that some able educational statistician will be attached to the staff for taking the census of 1861, in order to prevent the errors referred to, and furnish to the nation clear, correct, and useful returns of the state of education.

¶ The school age adopted in the English census embraces a range of 12 years, or from 3 to 15, and of 4,908,696 children between those ages, there were 2,046,848, or nearly 42 per cent., on the books of some school in 1851, apart from those under domestic tuition; so that on the whole, the relative numbers under instruction in Ireland are fully equal to those in England and Wales, being one in seven in the former, and one in eight in the latter. In Switzerland, one-fifth, in nearly the whole of Germany and in Denmark, one-sixth, in Holland and in France (exclusive of those in infants' schools), one-eight of the whole population attend school regularly.

instruction given, and with what degree of success? The copies (handed round) of the school programmes here submitted, show you that in the national schools the course of instruction laid down for the pupils is of the most liberal kind—where the teachers are capable of imparting it*—and scarcely inferior to that afforded in the primary schools of any country in the civilised world.

Here the social circumstances of the country come to be sensibly felt. One half the 560,000 pupils are classed by their own teachers as learning to spell and read words of one syllable only; in fact, in the first book, or primer. Why is this? One of the chief causes is the diminution of population, and consequent demand for labour.† Women now do work formerly done by men, and boys and girls work at labour heretofore done by men and women. Men's wages at eight-pence a-day have risen to double that amount, and occasionally to two shillings in many localities; and children are kept at home, some to save and some to earn the increased pay. The age at which the children are finally withdrawn from school has continued to rapidly lessen;‡ their attendance, while school-going, has become more irregular, and the age at which they are first sent to school has not been lowered. Owing to these causes, the reaction in the great social progress of the country has not, so far, been favourable to the education of the labouring classes, a result which the experience of other countries should have led us to expect. At an average, each of the 560,000 children in our schools attends little over half the number of days that the school is open for literary instruction; and as the average number of such days is only about 216 in the year, each pupil attends 108 days only. What with late hour of arrival in the morning, recreation at mid-day, religious instruction, industrial branches in nearly all girls' and in some boys' schools, &c., the time devoted to literary instruction each day does not amount to three and a half hours, so that each of the 560,000 pupils, at an average, cannot get over 360 hours' literary instruction in the year, or for one hour a day; a fact which must surprise all who for the first time hear it.

This is now the great practical difficulty of popular education, and that felt not alone here, but throughout Great Britain, France, and America. In Great Britain the average age of each of 571,239 pupils in 7,454 schools, aided last year by the Committee of Council on Education, was only 8·8 years; 70 per cent. of them were not over ten years, and the average time which each child had been at school was only 1·7 years, or 20⅓ months. I quote these astounding facts, lest you should suppose that there is anything peculiar in the sad statement regarding Ireland.

Here is a great question to which we all—supporters, as doubless we are, of various systems—can apply ourselves, with a view to suggest remedies for improvement. The means which appear to me most feasible for this end, are—

1st. The

---

* Numbers of the teachers are quite incompetent to carry out the advanced portions of the school programme, nor should this be matter for serious regret, as few pupils remain to attain that proficiency; more than half of them have never been trained, or never been regularly instructed in their duties. Up to the close of 1856, of 4,578 teachers of both sexes who had been trained by the National Board, 1,987 died, or left the service; and of a total of 5,385 then in office, 2,594 only were trained, and 2,794 were not trained. Their classification stood thus: first class teachers, 558, or ten per cent.; second, 1,357, or 25 per cent.; third, 2,553, or 47 per cent.; and probationers, or unclassed, 917, or 18 per cent. Of the 5,385 teachers, 401 were assistants. With the exception of those in model, convent, workhouse, and prison schools, these formed the entire staff of national school teachers.

† "You will probably trace the cause to our social condition, perhaps to a state of ignorance and lethargic indifference on the subject amongst the parents generally; but the rest of the evil will, I suspect, also be found to extend into that field on which the political economist exercises his activity—I mean the labour market—demand and supply."—*His Royal Highness Prince Albert.*

‡ It is now in or about eleven and a half to twelve years; the average age at which the children first go to school is about six and a half to seven years, and the average age of all the children found present by the 50 inspectors in 1856, was nine and a half years. In only two of the 50 districts did the average age of the scholars reach 11, and in only eight of the 50 did the average age of the girls exceed 10 years. Assuming as correct that four years is about the entire compass of the period of school attendance, and connecting this with the other facts here deduced, we find 1,440 hours, or 60 weeks of four hours a day for six days in the week, as the extreme average time during which each child might be now, but is far from necessarily, under, or receiving literary instruction during his entire school life. Even this mode of stating it practically errs in excess, as such attendance scattered over a space of four years, is not at all so effective as the same time spent continuously, especially in a large public school with low or insufficient teaching power, and where there is little self-study. This affords a disheartening present, and not a very hopeful future for popular education in Ireland, yet we find the same complaint in England. Mr. Horace Mann, in his preface to the educational census of 1851, says: "The average school time of all the children in England and Wales between their third and 15th years, is as nearly as possible five years, and between their fifth and 15th years it is four two-fifths years." His Royal Highness the Prince Consort at the inaugural meeting of the Educational Conference, June 22d last, stated the facts in a remarkably lucid manner: "At the same time an analysis of the scholars (2,046,848 who attend) with reference to the time allowed for their school tuition, shows that 42 per cent. of them have been at school less than one year, 22 per cent. during one year, 15 per cent. two years, 9 per cent. three years, 5 per cent. four years, and 4 per cent. five years. Therefore, out of the two millions of scholars alluded to, more than one million and a half remain only two years at school. I leave you to judge what the results of such an education can be. I find further that of these two millions of children attending school, only about 600,000 are above the age of nine. Gentlemen, these are startling facts, which render it evident that no extension of the means of education will be of any avail unless this evil, which lies at the root of the whole question, be removed, and that it is high time that the country should become throughly awake to its existence and prepared to meet it energetically. To impress this upon the public mind is the object of our conference. Public opinion is the powerful lever which in those days moves a people for good and for evil, and to public opinion we must therefore appeal, if we would achieve any lasting and beneficial result. You, gentlemen, will richly add to the services which you have already rendered to the noble cause, if you will prepare public opinion by your inquiry into this state of things, and by discussing in your sections the causes of it, as well as the remedies which may be within your reach."

1st. The more general establishment of infant schools, each containing not over 50 children, conducted by women, and so placed as to be central and conveniently situated in all towns.*

2d. In addition to ordinary day schools, morning, evening, and mechanics' institute schools in towns.†

3d. A diminution in all but moderate vacations.‡

4th. A system of Government grants to teachers, founded not merely on the certificates of scholarship which they may hold, but also on the number of pupils which they efficiently instruct.

From 1832 to 1838, the salaries or gratuities paid to the national teachers consisted of capitation, or per head grants, at so much per hundred pupils; but since 1838, the salaries have been personal to the teacher,§ depending mainly on his own literary attainments, and having little or no reference to the number or regularity in attendance of his pupils, or to the number benefited by his instruction.

In England, as here, this was found to work most injuriously, and a few years since a capitation scheme was introduced, allowing so much per head for each scholar who had attended 176 days in the year. Upon the favourable experience of this measure, a second, or half-time minute was passed in 1854, to meet the case of pupils who were engaged at work part of each day, or part of each week, and which accepted 88 days, instead of 176, in the case of boys over ten years of age. These minutes have worked most beneficially; and the application of the principle here in Ireland would have a similar effect, and would contribute most powerfully to improve the attendance of the pupils, by giving the teachers a more direct interest in it.

5th. Annual public examinations of the schools, attended by the clergy, gentry, and parents of the pupils;‖ awarding of prizes and certificates for combined proficiency and regularity of attendance; and the employers of labour, master tradesmen, and commercial and public establishments, attaching due weight to such certificates when engaging lads as apprentices, clerks, &c.¶

6th. The general establishment of small school farms, or of school gardens in rural localities;

---

* *See* paper read by Rev. M. Mitchell, Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools, "Educational Conference Essays," page 10.

† Rev. M. Mitchell suggests that a master should teach a morning school for boys, age ten to fourteen years, from six to nine, A.M., who then go to their trades or labours; a mistress to instruct the children of both sexes under ten years of age in a day school, from half-past nine to five o'clock, with two hours' recess; and the master to resume duty in an evening school for youths of fourteen to eighteen years of age, from six to nine o'clock.

‡ The vacations are extravagantly long in most schools. In elementary schools they should be intended chiefly for the health and relaxation of the teachers, and if there were an assistant in each school of fifty pupils, the business need not be suspended as the teachers could take vacation in turn. The Christmas vacation should be abolished, except perhaps for a few days, as it is the season when grown lads in the rural districts can best attend school.

§ The grants to Convent Schools are yet made on the capitation plan, and refer to the number of pupils only.

In 1854, I strongly urged the adoption of moderate class-salaries to teachers, with a graduated scale of capitation grants to supplement them, and which I showed would exercise a most beneficial influence on the state of education. The only objection I have ever heard urged against the proposed scheme was, that "it was a good plan for religious majorities." It is quite true it would equalise wages and work, and remove the anomaly that the teaching staff of the 1,882 schools in Ulster, with an attendance of 68,952 pupils, should receive salaries, &c. amounting to 36,895 *l.*, whilst the staff of the 1,270 schools of Munster, with a higher attendance (by 23 per cent.) of 85,311 pupils, receives salaries amounting to 26,932 *l.* only, or 27 per cent. less, the Munster teachers being as highly classed, and the schools conducted by them more efficient. Upon the basis of aggregate attendance alone, the salaries in Munster are 41 (*see* 1998/58) per cent. below those of Ulster, and the benefits of inspection, training books, &c., are also very unequally distributed.

‖ These examinations have done great good at the several district model schools, and the certificates (first suggested by me) are duly prized by the parents and pupils. Premiums are given in money, which, in the case of children, I deem most objectionable; books, &c., only should be given. Rev. Mr. Mitchell, Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools, says of school certificates, "More might be made of these certificates than has yet been attempted; and they might be distributed to youths, with more of form and solemnity, in large public places, attended by the chief magistrates and the dignitaries of Church and State of the neighbourhood, at once honoured and conferring honour." The Society of Arts in England and the Royal Dublin Society have instituted examinations, and grant certificates to those young men who pass in the prescribed course, and it is hoped that the holders of these will be sought after by public companies and commercial firms, and command a preference for employment. The Bank of Ireland and other companies here have pledged themselves to support the scheme.

¶ An order from the Horse Guards, dated 19 June 1857, sets forth the literary test to be applied to soldiers for promotion to the rank of corporal and sergeant, and states that, "it is scarcely less essential to the soldier to be able to read and write, and keep his own accounts, than to be acquainted with his drill." It is proposed that no person should be permitted to be employed in any occupation in which the lives of Her Majesty's subjects might be endangered, unless possessed of a certain amount of education—policemen, railroad servants, omnibus, coach, car, and cart drivers, officers of factories, mines, prisons, asylums, petty officers on board ship, &c.

localities;* of technical and trade schools in large towns; and of nautical schools in sea-ports and along the coast.†

Lastly. Classics and modern languages should be added to the national school course in all the district model schools, and at least in all towns of 10,000 inhabitants.

The spread of the national system, like a net-work over the whole country, has gradually closed the great majority of those private schools in towns, wherein heretofore lads might learn, at a moderate rate, the elements of Latin and Greek.‡ This is a most serious result, and one to which the attention of all men who have considered popular education in Ireland has been directed. It has tended, although heretofore without success, to reduce the Queen's Colleges to the condition of humble grammar schools; it has limited the number, by increasing the expense of the candidates for several of the professions; it practically excludes the mass of the people from all hope in sharing in most of the higher situations now open, or likely to be opened, to public competition; and it deprives the nation of the probability of drawing from amongst the struggling millions those sons of genius who have often been, and are now, the pride and the glory of not merely special professions, but of this University, of the British Association, and of the wide world of science.

The education now afforded in the higher national schools is of the most eminently practical character. It embraces a sound knowledge of our language, a thorough acquaintance with geography, an extensive course of elementary mathematics, the principles of political economy and of formal logic, the outlines of history, and the general principles of chemistry, and of all the branches of natural philosophy—in addition, vocal music and drawing.

It will at once be admitted, that if with this education there were combined an elementary course

---

* Of the many school-farms visited by me in Ireland, only a few realised anything like my idea of what they should be—Piltown on the Earl of Bessborough's estate, Dromiskin in Louth, and Ballymoney work-house, are the nearest and best types which I recollect. The farms should not exceed four to six acres. The school gardens are more particularly suited to infants' and junior schools, and although scarcely known here, they are common in Germany, where they (Kindergarten) were introduced by Frœbel, and are worked with the best results in Dresden, Hamburgh, Berlin, Dusseldorff, &c.; a few of them have been established in London, Brighton, and Liverpool.

† In reports made in 1848 and 1850, I suggested how the study of navigation might be extended in the national schools, and in 1851 I made a special report (*see* Report, National Board, 1851) upon the subject, founded upon a minute inquiry into the working of the Royal Hospital Schools at Greenwich. The proper means have not yet been taken to attract recruits to the large and expensive nautical schools opened in Waterford, Limerick, and Belfast.

‡ The national importance of primary, as compared with superior schools, is evident from the fact, that the heads of the latter returned only 18,502 as the number of their pupils in a week in April 1851, whereas the teachers of the former returned 485,963, or twenty-six times more. And although the former are returned as attending schools in which they may receive a superior education (or, as the census imports, learn a second language), numbers of them who are not intended for professions, never attempt any branches beyond those of an English and commercial education. The decrease in the number of professing classical schools through the country has been marked and rapid within the past ten or twelve years; and the tendency to this, from 1841 to 1851, is strikingly exhibited in the fact, that whilst the general population between these dates decreased less than 20 per cent., the number of pupils in these schools decreased 32 per cent., although the number of the middle and upper classes, from whom the pupils are chiefly drawn, suffered only a comparatively small diminution within the period. Superior national schools afford an education which, of its kind, is incomparably sounder, more practical, and more readily acquired than can now be obtained in any class of private schools in Ireland. The competition of these with the classical and private schools emptied the latter of the pupils not intended for professions, or who did not intend to study classics, and also of numbers of those intended to learn classics, but who first went to the national school to get the superior English education; and, unable to live by the classical element alone, the withdrawal of both classes is the real cause of the closing of many middle-class schools in the provinces.

In several carefully drawn up papers, and in some of my published reports, I have unsuccessfully laboured for the past eight years to have the above suggestion adopted. I have yet to hear one sound argument against it; the best ever advanced being specious and untenable, viz., that as the funds for national education are intended for the poor, to set apart any portion of them to promote the teaching of classics, unsuited to, or not required for the poor, would be a misapplication of the grant. Some of the parties who advance this, appear blind to the fact, that the national schools are attended by 67 per cent. of the entire population of all classes now under education in the country, and, consequently, that the advantages which they afford are not confined to the poor, but are also open to the children of operatives and artisans, of traders, farmers, and struggling professional men. The social roll in Clonmel, Belfast, Waterford, Limerick, and Marlborough street Model Schools is in itself a sufficient proof of the accuracy of that statement. Next, the funds are applied to several branches of instruction, either not originally intended, or which are now cultivated beyond that intention, as physical science, music, drawing, and agriculture; and it is chiefly the higher class of pupils, whose circumstances enable them to prolong their attendance, that derive most advantage from them, and not the children of the poor.

In all the training schools of England the young teachers intended for the schools under the Committee of Council have the opportunity of learning at least a second language; and examination papers on Latin, Greek, and French form optional portions of the course for certificates of classification. America (*see* Chambers' Notes on), France, Italy (*see* Cardinal Wiseman's evidence before the House of Commons), Germany, and Northern Europe have all distanced us, in respect of this subject. Kay says: "I saw one school in Leipsic with 14 class-rooms, and a similar number of teachers. The children of the poor, nearly all the children of the small shopkeepers, and many of the children of professional men, of merchants, and even of the nobles, sit there at the same desks side by side. I have seen this mingling of the children of all classes in all parts of Germany and Switzerland." Again, in Munich he says he asked the children in one class-room in what positions in life their parents were. One was a lawyer, another a physician, two were nobles, while many were the children of parents who were too poor to pay the school pence, and who were assisted by the city rates. There were ten admirable class-rooms, 10 teachers, and about 70 children in each class; all were equally neat and clean in person.

course of Latin, Greek, and one or more modern languages,* thousands of our pupils, and many of our teachers, would be attracted to the higher schools and colleges of the country; numbers would win their way into the public service, and the influence of this would be felt down to the humblest village school in the most remote district in the island.†

The higher qualified and more respectable national and model school teachers and organisers would thus soon obtain a practical monopoly of the promotions to inspectorships in their own department,‡ as from amongst such a body no competitive literary examination could exclude them from these offices, protected, as they would be, by the high marks which should in fairness be awarded for professional and technical knowledge of the duties to be performed.

The time is opportune for the consideration of this great national measure. The endowed schools§ and the Queen's Colleges are under inquiry, and from our universities to our village schools the whole of the literary institutions of the nation might be harmonised, their mutual dependence and relation defined, and their respective functions co-ordinated.‖

After the reading of the paper, the chairman, Mr. Chadwick, addressed the section upon it, and adverted to the influence of factory employment as a cause of the early withdrawing children from school.

Rev. Mr. *Marshall*, Castlejordan, author of a few pamphlets upon education, asked explanation as to some of the facts revealed by the census of 1851, and pointed out that the results were such as should not have been expected, considering the large grants from the State, and by subscription, to the National Board, and to the Church Education Society.¶

Colonel *Beamish*, K.H., observed that the section must feel greatly indebted to Mr. Kavanagh for the very able and interesting manner in which he had brought forward his valuable statistics relative to education. He trusted these figures, and the statement generally would materially assist in removing much of the ignorance and prejudice which existed on the subject. It was clear that no system of education could succeed in Ireland unless it was made satisfactory to the religious feelings of the great mass of the people.

Mr. *Pare*, in the course of some observations on the subject, stated that the numbers of children receiving education in various countries in Europe, as compared with the population, were:—in France and Holland, one in eight; in Prussia, and some parts of Germany, one in six; in Switzerland, one in five; in Scotland, one in seven; and in Glasgow, one in fourteen. He was happy to learn, that in Ireland, there were so many as one in ten in the national schools, while the aggregate proportion, at all schools in Ireland, was one in seven (hear, hear).

His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, on rising, said he would not occupy the time of the section by any remarks on the subject. He wished merely to mention one fact which he knew

---

* The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge have taken up the subject of granting *testamurs*, after examination, to persons so educated. The former grants the title of Associate in Arts (A.A.) to each student between 15 and 18 years of age who may pass the prescribed senior examination in, 1. Religion (optional); 2. English Literature; 3. History; 4. Languages; 5. Mathematics; and 6. Natural Science. Cambridge is favourable, and Rev. Dr. Graves, Dr. Shaw, and some of the Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, have also taken up the question with enthusiasm. The entire scheme was the suggestion of that distinguished educationist and philanthropist, Rev. F. Temple, late of Kneller Hall, one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, in a letter to his colleague, Rev. H. W. Bellairs, April 1857.

† *See* Mr. Chadwick's able paper read at this meeting, and in this section, on open competitive examination for admission to the Public Service.—*Robertson, Sackville-st.*

‡ Since the establishment of the national system, 20 persons who had for some time conducted national schools rose to the rank of inspector (four of these to that of head inspector), of whom 15 are yet in the service. Nine of the present staff of 66 inspectors have been appointed from the alumni of the Queen's Colleges; nine hold degrees from Trinity College, and others were students there; some had been students in Maynooth, or in colleges on the Continent; and, with the exception of a few, all had been engaged in educational pursuits of some kind previous to their appointment. Every inspector should, as I have long vainly urged, besides passing at least a strict qualifying examination, be nominated on probation only; and if not found technically qualified for the duties at the end of a year, his appointment should not be ratified. The inspection department costs 20,000*l.*, and the official establishment 10,000*l.* a year; and admission to offices in both should be obtained by open competitive examination, and not by the patronage, or nomination system, as at present. The nation will find, when too late, that the members of an unpaid commission expect to be paid in one form or another, and that the uncontrolled power to appoint incompetent or inefficient officers is the most extravagant and ruinous price which could be demanded for the discharge of such duties.

§ *See* Report of the Endowed Schools' Commission, just issued. I intend to suggest the terms of a truce, and the basis of a negotiation, by which the gates of the temple of Janus Scholasticus might be shut, having now been open during the thirty years' education war. This has led to a dissipation of the public energies, and their diversion from what should be their common object—imparting a better education, and to a larger number of the population.

‖ M. De Burgraff, the respected French Consul, deemed this paper of such importance, that he translated and forwarded it to the Imperial Government of France in September last.

¶ Rev. Mr. Marshall read the facts from one of his own pamphlets upon education, and some of the audience appeared to be under the impression that the drift of his remarks was unfavourable to the paper read by me. So far from this, there was not one statement in his remarks adverse to anything in my paper; he merely required explanation as to certain returns in the census for 1851, and not only did he say nothing against my paper, but I beg to thank him for the very kind and most generous terms in which he has written to me, approving of it.

knew from his own personal knowledge. The first time he ever saw the writer of the paper to which they had just listened, was as a school-boy in a country national school in Ireland* (loud applause).

Professor *Leslie* took occasion to deny the correctness of an observation made on a former day, that the Queen's Colleges were "humble grammar schools."† They had found that they were equal to the work for which they were intended (applause).

Lord *Monteagle* observed, that every one concerned in the management of a national school in Ireland, must be aware of the difficulty of getting a regular or constant attendance from the children. The withdrawal of the children from the schools was attributable to causes which His Excellency knew were prevalent in England, as well as in Ireland—the advancement of industry, the increase of employment, and of its remuneration. His Lordship strongly advocated the extension, under the National Board, of agricultural instruction, and stated that the amount given was productive of much good, while in his opinion it did not interfere with the ordinary instruction of the pupils. As an instance of the advantage to the people of the national system, he mentioned particulars concerning the case of a gentleman who, when a boy, attended a country national school, barefooted, and who now creditably fills a responsible remunerative situation in an eminent English mercantile house (applause).

APPENDIX.

For the last six months I have borne in silence the painful position in which the Commissioners of National Education placed me before the public, in relation to the reading of this paper at the late meeting of the British Association, and, in now publishing a brief explanatory statement of the matter, it is my sincere desire to confine it within the narrowest and the most temperate limits possible. This paper was read September 1st. September 10th it was submitted to the Board by me, and September 14th, the following advertisement appeared in the "Saunders's News Letter" of that date:—

National Board of Education.

To the Editor of "Saunders's News Letter."

Office of National Education,
Sir, 12 September 1857.

The Commissioners of National Education having learned that many persons believe that a paper lately read by J. W. Kavanagh, Esq., one of the head inspectors, before the British Association, on the "Rise, Progress, and Present Prospects of Popular Education in Ireland," was written with the approbation of the Commissioners, we have been directed to inform the public, through the medium of your journal, that so far from the paper in question having been written with their authority, they would, had Mr. Kavanagh previously acquainted them with his intention, have at once prohibited him from addressing the Association on the subject.

We are further directed to observe, that so long ago as 1832, a circular was issued by the Commissioners, in which it was ordered "that the inspectors and other officers of our Board be informed that they are not to publish any letter or document relating to its proceedings, or to any theological or political subject; and that they are not to write any letter on the business of the Commissioners, unless to them, or by their directions."

We have, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, } Secs.
James Kelly, }

On the appearance of this notice in the newspaper, I received several letters, and other communications, of sympathy, from various influential parties who approved of the Paper, expressing pain and surprise at the Board's act. This surprise will not be lessened when the

* Lord Morpeth visited Graiguenamanagh, county Kilkenny, in 1834, where there was a Catholic parochial school—then National—on the estate of his relation, Viscount Clifden, by whose family it, and several other schools in the county are liberally endowed. Lady Dover always felt the deepest interest in the success of the school at Graiguenamanagh; and perhaps no single institution of its kind in the British Empire has led to the advancement of so many men as this one establishment. *See* Report Endowed Schools, vol. iii., p. 149.

† Some of the newspapers so report this, but my own recollection is that Professor Leslie stated, that such observation had just been made in my paper. The learned gentleman was misinformed if he had been told that I had made any such observation on a former day, and those who heard me read the paper are aware that not only I made no such statement from it, but, to prevent misapprehension, when I came to the passage in question, I repeated the word "tended," adding, "mark you, tended, although heretofore without success, to reduce the Queen's Colleges to the condition of humble grammar schools." The fact of this tendency is admitted and undeniable, and two of the three presidents of the colleges so stated to me, one of them frequently. *See* Report Endowed Schools, vol. ii., p. 295, in proof that the three presidents declare that it is schools, not colleges, we want.

the singular facts are now made known, that my attention has never been called, directly or indirectly, to that advertisement, that I have not been furnished with any copy of it, nor of the paper in which it was inserted, and, further, I have no official evidence, beyond strong presumption, that the notice itself was authorised. Not only is this the case, but the following letter, written seven days after the date, and five after the insertion, of that notice, is the only communication which I have had from the Commissioners upon the subject:

(Board's Order, 11/9/57.)

Sir, Office of Education, 19 September 1857.

HAVING laid before the Board your letter of the 10th instant, submitting for perusal by the Commissioners the paper recently read by you before the British Association, we are to acquaint you that, by order of the Board, a fac-simile copy of the paper has been made, and that they have directed us to return you the original, which we accordingly now enclose.

We remain, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

James W. Kavanagh, Esq.,
Head Inspector of National Schools, Rathgar."

In this, the only official communication which I have had from the Board, there is no reference to the notice inserted in the newspaper, and after the perusal of the very paper read by me, there is neither blame for the past nor instruction for the future.

On the appearance of the advertisement, I addressed a letter to the Board on the 17th September, complaining of the treatment adopted. I showed that the circular of 1832, referred to in the notice, did not in any way apply to the paper read by me, as in reading it I did not "publish any letter or document relating to the Board's proceedings, or to any theological or political subject;" and that this circular, if such it may be called, was issued to four inspectors in October, 1832, on the ground that one of them, Mr. (now Dr.) Robert Sullivan, had written letters to the "Northern Whig," upon the then educational controversy. This circular is no where embodied, or printed, in any of the published proceedings of the Board; it referred to a matter which occurred some 25 years since, when I was a mere school-boy, 13 years of age, and I was indebted for any knowledge of its existence to a parliamentary volume—"Inquiry into the National System"—published 20 years ago. In reference to the allegation, that the Commissioners would have prevented me from addressing the association upon the subject of my paper, had I previously acquainted them with my intention, I reminded them that several of the Commissioners were members of the association, four of whom I had the honour to meet there, and even in the statistical section; that the notices of papers to be read each day, were published in the journals of the association, and in the morning newspapers; mine having been fixed for Monday, but not read till Tuesday, the notice was inserted on the two days; and, further, so well known was that intention to some of the Commissioners, and to the leading officers, that Mr. Cross, whose name is to the above notice, hurried from the Education Office, with the knowledge of at least one of the Commissioners, purposely to hear the paper, and several of the Board's officers were present during the reading of it. If my colleagues, if Mr. Cross, senior secretary, knew that there was any rule, or prohibition against the reading of the paper, or that it was in any way indiscreet for me to read it, would they have publicly abetted, and even applauded the proceeding; or would the Right Honourable A. Macdonnell, resident Commissioner, or the other Commissioners, many of whom were fully aware that I was about to read it, have failed to interdict me? I also showed that another officer of the Board read a scientific paper in the geological section at the meeting, and not only no censure has been extended to him, but no question has been raised for not having previously obtained permission.

To this letter of complaint of September 17th, I have received no reply, and yet the advertisement remains before the public, that the reading of my paper was deemed a violation of an order of the Board, and my conduct therein censured, although, except indirectly through that notice, I have never received reproach, written or oral, upon the subject.

The chair was lately taken by one of the Commissioners, at a meeting of the Historical and Literary Society, Sackville-street, the subject of discussion for the evening being "The Secular System of Education," and in the course of the warm debates which ensued, officers of the National Board, and of the Church Education Society, were the leading disputants, the learned chairman himself summing up the relative value of the arguments advanced on both sides. I do not presume to take exception to this proceeding, but so long as the notice of September last remains uncancelled on the files of the Saunders's News Letter, I must regard it as anomalous.

At the educational conference held in London, in June, under the distinguished presidency of the Prince Consort, not alone Peers, Prelates, and Members of Parliament, but the heads of the Committee of Council on Education were there, with a large number of the inspectors. The Earl of Granville, Lord President of the Council; Right Hon. W. Cowper, M.P., Vice-President; Rev. Messrs. Kennedy, Mitchell, Norris, Cook, Watkins, &c., and several other inspectors

inspectors and officers were present.* It is only within the last few days that I obtained a copy of the important papers read at that conference, and I take leave to advert to the marked similarity which some of them bear to several portions of my paper; the evils to which we addressed ourselves were alike, and, often, the remedies which we propose are identical. To exclude popular education from the statistical section of the British Association, or to question the expediency of having it there treated, as it has been, by one who has devoted his life and his best energies to promote it, are propositions too absurd to be noticed.

To my brother members of the Dublin Statistical Society this explanation is due, as it was to them I was indebted for the position assigned to me on the committee of the British Association, and they and other friends now see that, in reading this paper, drawn up at the urgent request of several able men, I violated no rule of the National Board, nor was I guilty of any official indiscretion whatever. I have endeavoured to make the paper more useful by the addition of copious notes, and I beg to submit it to my countrymen, trusting it may prove useful. The matter, calmly and correctly stated, is now before the public, and I leave the duty of explanation to the Commissioners, observing only, that the manner in which I was treated in this case, led to a rapid succession of differences, which ended in my voluntary withdrawal, last month,† from the Board's service, in preference to submission to punishment wholly unmerited.

The gracious and kind observations of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, and his attention on this occasion, were too generous and too flattering ever to be forgotten by me, and although recent circumstances have compelled me, from a sense of self-respect and honour, to withdraw from the service of the Commissioners of National Education, I shall never cease to labour for the advancement of popular education, and through devotion to which I had the honour to early attract the notice, and ever since enjoy, far beyond my very humble deserts, the distinguished patronage of that truly popular and good nobleman, the Earl of Carlisle.

Rathgar, Dublin, 27th March 1858. *James W. Kavanagh.*

(B. O. 11/9/57.)

Sir, Office of Education, 19 September 1857.

Having laid before the Board your letter of the 10th instant, submitting for perusal by the Commissioners the paper recently read by you before the British Association, we are to acquaint you that, by order of the Board, a fac simile copy of the paper has been made, and that they have directed us to return to you the original, which we accordingly now enclose.

We remain, &c.,

(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.,
Head Inspector of National Schools, Rathgar.

Extract from (Dublin) "Evening Packet," 5 September 1857.

"Irish Education.

"When Mr. Kavanagh, Head Inspector to the National Board, appears in the statistical department of the British Association to pronounce a pretentious and dogmatical opinion upon the system of education he is salaried to maintain, he places himself in a false position. That the Commissioners should desire to have their

* Mr. Horace Mann, Secretary to the Civil Service Commissioners, in a paper published by him, and intended to be read at the late educational conference, states that the principle is now fully recognised in the civil service in England, and practised by Her Majesty's inspectors of schools, of parties expressing unofficially, and publishing, their opinions upon questions of public interest.

† February 6th I tendered my resignation, as follows: "Reviewing the proceedings of the past few months in reference to me, I feel that self respect and honour alike compel me to adopt the course which the Board's order of November dictates, and with deep regret I, from this date, tender my resignation, and beg leave, after 24 years' (11 of which as head inspector) devoted labours in the cause of the national system to withdraw from the service of the Commissioners." February 13th, the order of the Board of the 12th was conveyed to me, thus: "Having laid before the Commissioners of National Education your letter of the 6th inst., in which you state: 'I from this date tender my resignation and beg leave to withdraw from the service of the Commissioners,' we are directed to inform you that the Commissioners accept your resignation." The terms in which I tendered my resignation are only partially quoted in this order, and all reference to the grounds upon which I took that step entirely omitted. To my own character this reluctant obtrusion of a matter personal to myself was due; the public will likely demand a fuller statement elsewhere.

their case pleaded before the section was natural; that they should act so indiscreetly, and in such bad taste, as to commit the task to one of their officials was rather unaccountable. The paper referred to carried no weight, in consequence of the source from which it emanated.

"It was possible for its compiler to throw his essay into such a proper and unassuming shape as would cause the audience to forget his official character, and appreciate his zeal as a statist. But that he did not do. 'Science knows no partialities. When, therefore, a meeting of an Association devoted to her culture is employed for the purpose of more or less directly serving party, a wrong is done her, and her and her honest worshippers have grounds for feeling aggrieved. Mr. Kavanagh forgot his station, the place, and the object of the sitting, when he discussed popular education in Ireland as if it were represented altogether in his own person as the mouthpiece of 'the Board.'

"We do not feel disposed to occupy our columns with a rehearsal of the paper to which allusion is here made. Its gist was the assertion that the National Board is an all but perfect institution--in its basis, in its books, teachers, organisation, registration, and inspection. Ireland (ejaculates the official) would become an island flowing with knowledge and virtue under its influence were children not taken from school at too early an age to work in the field, and the Commissioners restricted from adding to their costly model-farms other models of a similar type, as model-gardens, trade schools, &c., and from establishing classical academies for the purpose of opening the beauties of 'Juvenal' to those whose priests veil from them the saving utterances of Scripture. It is Mr. Kavanagh's hope that a time will arrive when the peasant shall be forced to send his children to the National School instead of the corn ridge, and the Commissioners become master-cobblers as well as pedagogues for the Queen's Colleges.

"Have not the Commissioners already too many irons in the fire? Do they want fresh opportunities for jobbing? It would be satisfactory if they showed why it is that their existing agricultural establishments grow more expensive as pupils decline. This matter cleared up, they might with a better grace ask for new funds and larger powers. Now we say that very serious questions are raised by the chimerical proposal that the Board of National Education should be allowed to rush still farther away than they have already done from their primary duty of instructing the poor. Mr. Kavanagh boasts that 600,000 children attend their schools. Are these thoroughly taught in reading, writing, ciphering, and the elements of our mother tongue? Are they indoctrinated with sentiments of reverence for the Creator, with principles of honour, of independence, loyalty, respect for social usages, and attachment to the laws? We feel assured that the Commissioners have yet a vast work to do before they can lay claim to the credit of having provided the sons and daughters of the Irish peasantry with a thoroughly good education. There is great reason to apprehend that this their chief, and perhaps only proper sphere, has been considerably neglected for the sake of "model" erections of very doubtful value. We have found the most extraordinary ignorance existing on very essential matters among numbers of children attending National Schools; and our decided conviction is, that the general secular instruction afforded by the Board is not as solid as it ought to be. This was admitted, indeed, before the late Parliamentary Committee; and things have notoriously retrograded since that investigation took place.

"We object to Mr. Kavanagh's paper because he comes forward, not to speak of what is being done for Irish education, but exclusively of what 'the Board is doing.' Is there no instruction but that afforded by the Commissioners? He pooh-poohs the efforts of the Church Education Society, although it spends of the voluntary contributions of the people between 40,000 *l.* and 50,000 *l.* a year on the educational, moral, and spiritual elevation of the people. Mr. Kavanagh, we repeat, should have left the task of reviewing popular instruction in Ireland to a person not precluded by an official connexion with the scheme of one party from doing justice to the other great party. An important work is going forward in Ireland for the upraising of the people from ignorance and spiritual destitution, carried on by the faithful clergy of the Irish Church; but it is not Mr. Kavanagh's interest to acknowledge how vast has been its success."

(B. O. 11/9/57.)

Sir, Office of National Education, 12 September 1857.

The Commissioners of National Education having learned that many persons believe, that a paper, lately read by J. W. Kavanagh, esquire, one of the head inspectors, before the British Association, on the "Rise, progress, and present prospects of Popular Education in Ireland," was written with the approbation of the Commissioners, we have been directed to inform the public, through the medium of your journal that, so far from the paper in question having been written with their authority, they would, had Mr. Kavanagh previously acquainted them with his intention, have at once prohibited him from addressing the association on the subject.

We are further directed to observe, that so long ago as 1832, a circular was issued by the Commissioners in which it was ordered, "That the inspectors and other officers of the Board be informed, that they are not to publish any letter or document relating to its proceedings, or to any theological or political subject; and that they are not to write any letter on the business of the Commissioners, unless to them, or by their directions."

We have, &c.

(signed) *Maurice Cross*, } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

To the Editor of
"Saunders's News Letter, &c.,"
Dame-street.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 17 September 1857.

I beg leave to inform the Commissioners, that I read with surprise, and with very deep pain, the advertisement with your names attached, in reference to the paper on "The rise, progress, and present prospects of Popular Education in Ireland," lately read by me in the statistical and economic section of the British Association, which appeared in the "Saunders's News Letter" of the 14th instant.

I distinctly understood from the remarks of the Lord Chancellor upon the subject on Friday last, that the consideration of that paper was to take place at a future meeting of the Board, and I was thus surprised to see the insertion of the advertisement, dated next day, as I had hoped to be able before the matter would come under consideration, to submit important information upon the subject.

In the advertisement, the reason assigned for its insertion is, that the Commissioners had learned that many persons believe that my paper was written with their approbation; and if the source of information was reliable, and the number of persons under such belief so considerable as to require a public advertisement as the only suitable mode of correcting their error, I should feel perfectly satisfied, however it might pain my feelings, that the course adopted was unavoidable. I beg leave, however, to assure the Commissioners, that from none of the crowded audience who heard me read the paper, from none of the gentlemen who took part in the discussion which followed its reading, from none of the many hundreds of eminent persons from the three kingdoms who have spoken to me upon the subject, have I heard, even the slightest hint, that the Commissioners had any connexion whatever with the paper, its composition, or statements. "The Evening Packet" newspaper of the 6th instant, is the only instance that I know or have heard,* in which such an opinion is expressed. The opening of the paper shows most clearly my view of my position, that I was perfectly free, as any other member of the association, as to my right to read a paper or take part in discussions; but the subject taken up being suggestive of some discussions of a nature upon which I conceived I was not free to enter, I announced the exclusion from my paper of all matter which might tend to any such discussion. I stated, "In laying before the meeting this sketch, it will be alike my wish as my duty to avoid touching upon any grounds which might lead to controversy unsuited to the broad and common platform

* The "Daily Express" of the 16th, is subsequent to the insertion of the advertisement.

platform upon which we meet, and confine myself within those limits of the question which my official position under the national system permits me to discuss, and in which alone the economic and statistical section of the British Association can feel more immediately interested." The strongest evidence that the intention thus expressed was successfully carried out in the paper, was the absence of all discussion, other than of a statistical, social, and general character, consequent on its reading.

In the advertisement the Commissioners also state that so far from the paper having been written with their authority, they would, had I previously acquainted them with my intentions, at once have prohibited me from addressing the association on the subject. It appears to be admitted, then, that popular education is the subject objected to, not the manner in which I treated it, nor the matter of my paper upon it. I beg leave to remind you that one of my colleagues read an excellent paper in our Dublin Statistical Society, of which some of the Commissioners are Vice Presidents, and several are members, upon the Statistics of Irish Education, National and otherwise, especially in reference to the census of 1851. This same subject is a portion of my paper, as you may perceive, and the general object of my paper is to briefly set forth the progress of popular education so far as it can be expressed by arranging general facts stated numerically. As my colleague incurred no censure, so far as I have ever heard, and as no restriction beyond that suggested by individual prudence has, to my knowledge, been ever placed upon the many officers of the Board, who are known to be members of scientific societies—I have the honour to belong to five—I could see no necessity for formally intimating beforehand to the Commissioners the precise part which I meant to take in the proceedings of the British Association. I beg leave to remind you that on the 17th ult., on the occasion of requesting leave of absence for a week from the 27th ult., I intimated to you by letter that it was in order to afford me time to give my undivided attention to the business of the meeting of the British Association. I also beg to state that meeting the resident Commissioner by accident in the office on Saturday 22d ult., a conversation arose in reference to the British Association and to the reading of a paper by Dr. Clarke, and although at this time it was very generally reported that I was also to read a paper, no remark was made to me upon the subject, intimating any objection to such a course. When the proceedings of the British Association opened, the names of at least six of the Commissioners appeared amongst the list of members, and five of them I saw present in the sections, and I also saw in attendance at the meetings ten of the Board's officers from the several departments of the institution. During the meeting the Journals of the Association, and also the three daily newspapers, announced each morning the papers to be read for that day, and on Monday, 31st ult., it was intimated that my paper would be read the eighth of 11 set down for that day's business in the section. Here was ample opportunity to intimate to me the existence of any rule* which would prevent me from reading such a paper; or if such rule did not exist, of even questioning the expediency of the proceedings. Had any one of the Commissioners, or even had either of the secretaries, one of whom I met at several places during the week, raised such a question, I would have felt it my duty to at once abandon the intention of reading the paper. On Monday 31st the reading of the paper was put off, owing to protracted discussion on a paper by Mr. Chadwick, and I that day announced in the section that it would come on next day, and to prevent misconception as to its nature I stated that it would be mainly statistical and social, and free from all special, pedagogic or theological views. Dr. Sullivan, Dr. Newell, Mr. Sheehy, and other officers of the Board were present in the section during this announcement. That same day, and after making that announcement, I went to the Education Office on business (near 4 o'clock), and was seen in the grounds by one of the Commissioners. That night, in the Dublin Society, his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant inquired regarding the reading of my paper next day; and, unsolicited by me, his Excellency was pleased to imply that he would be present at the hour when

* The circular of 1832 I never got. I was then a boy of 13 years of age and at school, nor have I ever seen it, or the terms quoted from it, until I read the advertisement on Monday last. I do not think my paper is prohibited by it, but had I known of its terms, or been reminded of it by those who knew of it, I would have felt it my duty to inquire if under it the reading of my paper was improper.

when I expected it would be read The Journals of the Association and the three daily papers announced on Tuesday morning that the paper would be read the fourth of 12 papers on that day. Here, again, there was ample time to intimate any existing or apprehended objection to the reading of the paper. Instead, several of the officers hurried to hear it—Mr. Cross from the office, but he arrived late, Dr. Newell, head inspector, Mr. Sheehy, &c. &c., and although some of the Commissioners must have been speaking to them on the subject, even after the reading the paper, neither on that day nor on the next when I was in the office and schools and met the President Commissioner, did I hear one word of objection made to the paper. I may now advert to the newspapers' report, imperfect as it was, of what occurred in the Section after the reading of the Paper. The kind and remarkable words of his Excellency, so far as I know the only occasion on which he spoke in any of the Sections, brought tears to my eyes, and over 23 years of my life before me, and I could then have little anticipated the clamours of "The Warder," "The Packet," and "The Daily Express" would outweigh the undisguised approbation of his Excellency the Earl of Carlisle, of Lord Monteagle, of Colonel Beamish, of Mr. Chadwick, of not only all who took part (save one who misapprehended my statement about the Queen's Colleges) in the subsequent discussion, but of not much under 1,000 leading men of the three kingdoms who have since spoken to me, or written to me upon the subject.

I am sorry to be compelled to express my firm conviction, a conviction frequently expressed for the past three years, by several other officers of the Board, that there is a connexion (through whom I am unable to prove), between the portion of the Dublin press, notoriously unfavourable to the national system, and to its sincere supporters, and some persons in the Board's service. An examination of the files of some of these papers during the inquiry of 1854, in reference to Professor M'Gauley's case more recently, and the number of "The Daily Express" for the 16th instant, can leave no doubt whatever as to the fact; not only is this so, but so far back as the 7th instant I was warned by a kind and influential friend, and since by others, that both officially and through the press this combined and simultaneous attack would be made upon me, because of the success that had attained to my paper, and the attention which had been shown to me in the British Association and elsewhere.

My character I shall defend as I would my life; my long and faithful services to the national system, and to my country, give me some claim to consideration; and feeling that in this, and in a few other cases recently, a different conclusion would be arrived at if full time and fair opportunity were afforded to me to have the merits of the questions amply and clearly stated, and discussed by a full Board, with time to devote to them, I appeal to the Commissioners for such trial. I have the fullest confidence in their justice, and the deepest respect for their wisdom; and with such feelings, the growth of my whole life, I cannot believe that if this statement had been called for, and considered by them, the advertisement, so painful to me, and joyful to the enemies of the Commission, and of the national system, would have been inserted in the public papers.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh*,
Head Inspector National Schools.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

(B.O. 25/9/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 26 September 1857.

Your letter of the 17th instant having been laid before the Board, we are to inform you that the Commissioners of National Education do not deem it necessary at present to make any comments thereon, except with reference to the following passage, which their particular attention has been called to.

"I am sorry to be compelled to express my firm conviction, a conviction frequently expressed for the past three years by several other officers of the Board, that there is a connexion (through whom I am unable to prove), between the portion of the Dublin press, notoriously unfavourable to the national system, and to its sincere supporters, and some persons in the Board's service. An examination of the files of some of these papers during the inquiry of 1854, in reference to Professor M'Gauley's case more recently, and the number of 'Daily Express' for

for the 16th instant, can leave no doubt whatever as to the fact. Not only is this so, but so far back as the 7th instant, I was warned by a kind and influential friend, and since by others, that both officially and through the press, this combined and simultaneous attack would be made upon me, because of the success that had attended my paper, and the attention which had been shown to me in the British Association and elsewhere."

As regards this very serious charge against some of the officers of this establishment, the Commissioners call on you to say if you can produce any proof whatsoever in support of this charge.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,*
James Kelly, } Secretaries.

Sir, Education Office, 5 October 1857.

Referring to our letter of the 26th ult. with respect to the charge made by you against some of the officers of this establishment, we are to request that you will furnish, not later than Thursday next the 8th instant, any proof you have to offer in support of your charge.

We are, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross,*
J. Kelly, } Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 6 October 1857.

In reply to your letter received this morning in reference to the statement contained in my communication of the 26th ult., I beg leave to inform you that it would be quite out of my power to furnish any letter of evidence respecting the matter by Thursday next, the 8th instant, as you require. You are aware of my engagement for last week, and since my return I have not been in town to refer to the files of newspapers for facts and statements in support of my opinions, and to-morrow being a holiday, I could not have the matter ready as you desire.

I shall lose no time in preparing a statement, and it is likely I may be able to submit it by the 15th instant.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries, Education Board.

Sir, Education Office, 20 October 1857.

Referring to your letter of the 6th instant, mentioning that you expected to be able to show by the 15th the connexion existing between some officers of this establishment and the press, we are to request that as this information has not been received up to the present date, you will inform us if you can furnish it by Thursday next the 22d instant, so as to submit it to the Board on the following Friday.

We are, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross,*
J. Kelly, } Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

Gentlemen, Bailieborough, 21 October 1857.

In reply to your letter of the 20th instant, in reference to my statement that there has been a connexion between some parties in the Board's service and a certain portion of the Dublin newspaper press, I beg to inform you that during last

last week I was in daily expectation, pending correspondence with Mr. Adair, of coming here on duty, and on this account I did not enter upon that question or collect evidence relating to it. All this week I shall be busily engaged closing my duties for this year in this district, and on my return I shall lose no time in preparing an answer to your letter. I cannot, owing to the nature of the case, name any precise day when it may be ready; but I beg to assure you that the matter will not be delayed by me.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries, Education Office,
Dublin.

Sir, Education Office, 31 October 1857.

We are to remind you of our communication of the 20th instant, regarding the statement made by you that there existed a connexion between some of the officers of this establishment and the public press.

As the committee appointed for inquiring into several matters relating to you are to assemble for the purpose on some day before the latter end of next week, we are to direct that you furnish any evidence you may have to offer in support of your statement without further delay.

We are, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross,* } Secretaries.
J. Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 5 November 1857.

In my letter of September 17th, respecting the paper lately read by me before the British Association, I stated, "I am sorry to be compelled to express my firm conviction, a conviction frequently expressed for the past three years by several other officers of the Board, that there is a connexion, through whom I am unable to prove, between the portion of the Dublin press notoriously unfavourable to the National system, and to its sincere supporters, and some persons in the Board's service," and I am called upon to furnish any evidence in support of this assertion.

"The Dublin Monitor" newspaper, edited by Mr. Durham Dunlop, was at first favourable to the Board and to its administration, and contained very many leading articles upon the National system. The editor was the intimate private friend and social companion of Professors Sullivan and M'Gawley, and of Mr. Cross. It will not be denied by any of these parties that when Mr. Dunlop changed his tactics, and published a pamphlet containing most severe strictures upon the working of the system, a large portion of the adverse information was obtained through the private intercourse with these officers. I am far from imputing to them any hostile motive in imparting this information, which I should rather believe was obtained where and when it was not expected to be used as it came to be; but I have reason to know that Mr. Dunlop, now editor of the "Belfast Mercury," and who has lately written most severely against the Board in reference to Professor M'Gawley, continued on terms of social intercourse with one of the parties mentioned.

I heard from many persons, that on the occasion, some few years since, of an unpleasant discussion between some of the staff in the Inspection Office, which led to serious consequences, the occurrence was communicated by some of the same staff to the "Christian Examiner," notoriously hostile to the National system, and thereupon it charged the Board with abetting ribbonism.

During the discussions at the Board in 1852-53, in reference to the question of the religious books, it was an ordinary topic of remark and surprise, that not merely were some of the Dublin press kept, *au courant*, informed of the discussion, but even that circumstances occurring at the meetings of the Board were sometimes in the papers of next morning

The last article in the "Evening Packet" newspaper (September 10th 1857) upon the M'Gawley controversy, he added, "The Irish Star Chamber," bears internal evidence that some of its statements and many of its comments were supplied by officers of the Board, either directly or indirectly.

The portion of the question which immediately applies to myself is the newspaper comments upon me, and the paper read by me at the meeting of the British Association. The "Daily Express" of the 4th September contains a leading article upon that paper, and in the same number large extracts from its matter. That journal resumes the subject in a leader of the 16th September, and which bears the clearest evidence upon every portion of it that it was either actually written, which I firmly believe, by an officer of the Board, or, at least, that the main facts of it were supplied from parties in the service. In town and country no person who has spoken to me upon the subject entertains any doubt upon the matter as to the materials of the article having been supplied from official sources. What had the advertisement, as to my arithmetic, to do with the professed topic of the paper read by me before the British Association? What do Mr. Godkin and Mr. Robinson know of my private history? Where did they ascertain that I had been a pupil in a school of Lady Diver's? How, or by what law of chance did the two topics, the paper and the advertisement, which had been before the Board on the Friday previous, meet in the same article in the Wednesday number of the "Express"? In the whole history of the newspaper controversy upon national education there is no parallel for the allusion that "I had the Board in my pocket," &c., in reference to my arithmetic, in the face of the fact that several have made large sums by the sale of their books through the schools, and through their official position, and I not a shilling. So clear and conclusive was the evidence that the article in question had been either written or suggested by official parties, that on its appearance persons in high position at once declared their conviction to that effect, and even to the extent that the very phraseology used the day previous in Marlboro'-street was woven into the article. There is nothing the proof of which is indirect and resting on internal and circumstantial evidence, that I believe more firmly than that the article in the "Express" of the 16th September was written by some party in the Board's service, and this belief is shared in by every one not connected with as well as under the Board, to whom I have spoken upon the matter. It is not necessary for me to travel beyond what I have stated, or I could supply material facts in sustentation of the connexion adverted to, especially as to the "Daily Express."

I remain, &c.

The Secretaries, Education Office. (signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

P. S.—I request that the number of the "Daily Express" for the 16th September be laid before the Board.

J. W. K.

Education Office, Training Department,
13 November 1857.

Gentlemen,

Having heard that Mr. Kavanagh has said or insinuated that I have been mixed up in some way with the attacks made upon the Board by Mr. Dunlop, of the "Belfast Mercury," I beg to say that I have not written a line to that gentleman on any subject for the last 15 years; and that since the time he attacked the National system of education, and ridiculed the programme and lectures of the professors, I have never held "social", nor in fact any intercourse with him. I am quite aware that he entertains friendly feelings towards myself personally, and I have now no other feelings towards him; and I do, and would speak to him if I met him, but this is all. With regard to the articles referred to, I never saw them till they were shown me in Mr. Cross's office, and I at the time strongly condemned them, and still do condemn them.

It seems Mr. Kavanagh requires me to give proofs of the charge or statement which I made regarding him in Mr. Sheehy's case; I will not, either directly or indirectly enter into a controversy with him; but if it be thought necessary, he may

may be referred in addition to what is stated in my letters of the 2d and 3d instant, to my and Mr. Rintoul's letters in April last, and also to his own letter to the Board on the defeat of the training establishment, and his proposed remedies.

I am &c.

The Secretary, &c. &c. (signed) *Robt. Sullivan.*

Note.—The continuation of this case will be found in a Return to an Order of the House of Commons, dated 1 July 1858. (*Mr. Henry Herbert*).

No. 1. (K.)

CORRESPONDENCE between the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools), and with the Rev. *R. Sadleir*, D. D., relative to the Conduct of Mr. *Kavanagh*, when inspecting the Porterstown and the Phœnix Park National Schools. From the 21st September to the 24th November 1857.

Gentlemen, Castleknock, 21 September 1857.

PERHAPS you will be good enough to inform me, does your Board require that managers of National Schools shall enter reports of their visits in the report book for the inspection of your inspector?

I am led to make this inquiry in consequence of a verbal message left for me with the mistress of both my schools by Mr. Kavanagh on the occasion of his late inspection, that he would thank me to do so in future.

I have been under the impression that the inspectors should submit their reports to the managers, and not the managers to the inspectors. I know that in my own case it would have been more satisfactory to me if Mr. Kavanagh had entered in the report book anything he had to say, or corresponded with me upon the subject, than that he should leave verbal messages of an unpleasant nature with the teacher, and give me no other information respecting his visit than from what I can gather from them.

Their report, however, is so very unfavourable, that although it is peculiarly painful to me to make complaints, particularly against a person who, I am delighted to perceive, has raised himself from a pupil to be a head inspector, capable of addressing the British Association, I do not consider I would be discharging my duty if I did not take some further notice of his visit than I have done in making the above inquiry. I take leave, therefore, to add, that I object to his visiting my schools at a few minutes before the time of closing, and detaining the children and teachers for an hour after.

I also strongly object to his remarking within the hearing of the children, that some of them were too young to read the Scriptures, and particularly to his calling upon the children to parse that sacred word "God," or any sentence written upon the board in italics to indicate that it is an extract from Scripture.

I also think that the inspectors should agree amongst themselves as to how the rolls should be kept.

Because my teacher kept them as the district inspector directed, Mr. Kavanagh was highly displeased, ordered them to get new books, and, in the only hour they have for rest and recreation, to write them all out again (a work of no inconsiderable labour), charged them at their peril not to disobey him, and expressed himself in such angry terms that the teachers in both schools gave vent to their feelings in tears, as did also the children; and the teacher of one school was so overcome by the violence of his manner, that she was forced to leave the room. His demeanour, in fact, both to children and teachers, caused such a panic that his visit was worse than useless.

To leave a verbal message for my curate, who is not favourably disposed towards National Schools, that he must attend more regularly, and enter his observations for his inspection at every visit, appears to me, to say the least of it, to be indiscreet; and to make every exertion short of actual force to enter the private apartment of a youthful female teacher in the absence of anyone but herself, seems to

me a strange proceeding on the part of a head inspector of the Board of National Education.

As my schools are three miles distant from each other, and the teachers unacquainted with each other, I cannot question the truth of their reports, which agree and are corroborated by the children.

It would have been more satisfactory to me, however, if he had entered on the report book the result of his inspection, and I shall be glad to hear that instructions to that effect have been given by your Board.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *R. Sadleir*, D. D.,
Manager of the
Phœnix Park and Porterstown Schools.

The Secretaries of the
National Board of Education.

(B.O. 11/9/57.)

School struck off.

Porterstown National School, County Dublin, Roll No. 6003.

Office of National Education, Dublin,
Sir, 23 September 1857.

THE Commissioners of National Education have removed the above school from the roll of National Schools, and have cancelled their grants thereto from 31st December next, the school having failed to secure an attendance sufficient to warrant further continuance of aid.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, *James Kelly*, } Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq., Head Inspector.

(B.O. 11/9/57.)

Porterstown School, County Dublin.

Office of National Education,
Sir, 25 September 1857.

THE Commissioners of National Education have removed the name of the above school from the roll of National Schools, and have cancelled their grants thereto from the 30th December 1857, the school having failed to secure such attendance as would warrant the continuance of aid.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, *James Kelly*, } Secretaries.

Rev. Dr. Sadleir, Castleknock.

(B.O. 25/9/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 26 September 1857.

THE Commissioners of National Education having had before them a letter of the 21st instant from the Rev. Dr. Sadleir, of which the enclosed is a copy, they direct that you will furnish to this office not later than Thursday next the 1st proximo, in order that it may be laid before the Board on the following Friday, a clear and explicit explanation on every point referred to in Dr. Sadleir's letter.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, *James Kelly*, } Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 27 September 1857.

As my time will be wholly occupied with other duty in Trim, until next Saturday, I am obliged to reply to the Rev. Dr. Sadleir's letter to-day.

1. *Entry of Rev. Dr. Sadleir's and of his Curate's Visits in Report Books.*—It is my duty to examine the visitors' entries, and to inquire into the extent of local superintendence exercised over the schools. I did so in both Dr. Sadleir's schools, and learned that he visited seldom, but that his curate visited Porterstown, National School, about once a month; and I requested politely, it is not denied, that the teachers would call their and all other visitors' attention, to the printed instruction (No. 12, page 9, in Report Book) as to the entry of their names, date of visit, and numbers found present. Numbers of distinguished persons have visited Phœnix Park National School, and have recorded same in Report Book.

2. *Submitting my Reports to Managers.*—I am not bound to do so.

3. *Hours of Inspection.*—Porterstown National School. On the 11th August I went out to inspect St. Bridget's National School, Castleknock, and on arriving there I found it closed; but I remained some time, examining the house and premises. Not wishing to lose my day, I inquired the way to Clonsilla National Schools, and proceeded there; but on my arrival I found these closed also, and, as I was informed, all the schools of the parish, owing to the visitation that day, in Blanchardstown chapel, by the Roman-catholic archbishop.

I met Porterstown school, and so little did I know of its situation that I passed it (the inscription was quite hid by rose trees); and finding on inquiry that it was a National School, I returned and entered it at half-past one o'clock, and remained in it till half-past four o'clock. But when it struck three, the mistress reminded me of the hour, and I soon closed the examination of the twelve children (aged 6 ½ years), and had them sent home. I after proceeded with the examination of the accounts, &c., and as the teacher lives in the schoolhouse, no inconvenience arose to her from the delay.

As to Phœnix Park National School.—I visited there 30th April, and examined from nine o'clock to a quarter past twelve o'clock; 28th May, from a quarter before two to six o'clock (with Mr. Coyle), and visited merely, just as pupils were being sent home, 18th June; the time for closing the schools is twenty minutes past three o'clock. At my first visit I found the accounts of the school in a shamefully neglected state; rarely have I ever met any so extremely neglected. That day I had to go to Naas Male National School (see my journal), and I pointed out to the teachers the necessity for having these serious defects remedied when I would visit to complete my inspection. On visiting on 28th May (I had been off in Mayo and in the north meantime), I met Mr. Coyle in the school, and the state of the accounts in it had been a subject of serious conversation with us after my first visit. We examined the pupils till the hour of closing, when we directed all the pupils to be sent home, with the exception of the senior classes (11 girls), and these we detained for about half or three quarters of an hour longer. The teacher, Miss Reynolds then told us that as the hour for going to her private tuition was past, she had no objection to remain. I then, with Mr. Coyle, went over the rolls, report book, and register with her; pointed out to her the irregular and negligent manner in which they were kept, notwithstanding the instruction given to her at my previous visit; and, on the interference of Mr. Coyle, again gave her a last trial, to put them in order by next visit. Again, 18th June (after visiting Chapelizod Schools), I drove to the Phœnix Park School, just as the children were leaving, and did not detain or stop them, as I merely wanted to ascertain had Miss Reynolds put the accounts in order. I found that she had taken steps to do so, but she again failed to carry out our instructions, whereupon I gave her an order to get new books at the depôt, that she might put her accounts in proper order. Miss Reynolds lives in the schoolhouse, with her mother and sisters.

4. *Reading the Scriptures; name of "God."*—On inquiring in both schools as to the time, &c., for religious instruction, I asked the Protestant teachers whether, in the case of children too young to read the Scriptures, the Scriptures were read to them. Average age of the 60 children, in both schools, 8·3 years, of whom 23 were in first book, and of the rest only 23 could attempt to read

second or third books. As to parsing the word "God," whilst I do not yield to Dr. Sadleir in due reverence to that or any other sacred name, I do not think that feeling would make me exclude it from the rules, inflections, and grammatical changes to which it must be subjected in order to speak or write correctly whenever it occurs. I am quite sure Dr. Sadleir would not strike "Deus" out of the Latin grammar. He is mistaken when he states that there are any extracts from the Scriptures in the Board's reading tablets, and also in supposing that it is because any portion of the tablets is from the Scripture the words of the passage are printed in italics.

5. *Keeping the Rolls.*—So far as I know, the inspectors of his schools are quite agreed as to the keeping of the rolls. I do not credit the teacher of Porterstown, and she must be mistaken in stating that Mr. Coyle desired her or permitted her not to strike off the names of children who had been absent for thirteen consecutive weeks.

In Porterstown there were only 18 names upon the roll, but there were 28 upon the register. It is unnecessary to detail the neglect in the accounts; they could scarcely be worse kept, and by a trained teacher, with only eighteen scholars, an average attendance of only 11 ½ pupils, and no school kept on Saturday. In like manner in the Phœnix Park school, with a trained teacher and an assistant to an average of 51 pupils, the accounts were shamefully neglected; and in both instances the teachers, in having their neglect pointed out, and the unsatisfactory apologies for it refuted, they whimpered and appeared concerned, Miss Reynolds retiring to her own room to her family for some time. Mr. Coyle was present, and he can bear witness that throughout I have been most kind, gentle and considerate to Miss Reynolds. It evinces little experience, indeed, of females or children to infer violence of manner as the cause of a tear. The pupils crying, and the alleged panic in the schools, are simply unfounded statements.

6. *Message for Dr. Sadleir's Curate.*—This statement is quite incorrect, beyond the fact that I called teacher's attention in Porterstown to the instructions in report book as to the entry of visitors' names, &c.

7. *Exertion to enter the Private Apartment of a Teacher.*—I am at a loss to know to what can this refer. It cannot refer to Phœnix Park School, as teacher's mother and sisters were in their apartments during my visit, and I occupied their parlour (teacher being absent in Dublin) whilst the school-room was being swept out from 9 to 9¼ o'clock, a. m., when I first visited. In Porterstown the first floor contains two school-rooms, and in one of which there is a stair. As is my duty, I asked the use of the second floor, and teacher told me that she lived there with her mother. Beyond this there is not a particle of truth in the statement made. I never set my foot on the stairs, much less went near any of the apartments, and, so far as I know to the contrary, the floor in question may be used for any conceivable purpose, and may have two or twenty apartments. From the dismissal of the pupils to the close of my inspection there was not a being in either of the school-rooms but the teacher and myself.

8. *Leaving my Report in the Report Book.*—I left the usual entry and that alone required by my instructions.

I have gone now through every point in the letter of Dr. Sadleir, and I regret to see such a communication from him. I called on him, as did Mr. Coyle also, last spring, and we proposed to organise and improve his schools: at least Phœnix Park, but he declined our offer.

Porterstown enjoyed a grant for a long period without just claim of average; and even now, when it is struck off, he is to have a salary continued for months after, although older schools, with higher average, have not the like favour extended to them when struck off. Not merely the Commissioners but the officers have evinced every desire to co-operate with him; and one of them, at least, has never merited at his hands the communication which, from its generally unfounded statements, he must, as a gentleman and a clergyman, regret having forwarded.

I am, &c.

(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries,
Education Office, Dublin.

Phœnix Park and Porterstown National Schools.

Office of National Education,
3 October 1857.

Sir,

We have had the honour of laying before the Commissioners of National Education your letter of the 21st ult., who referred it to Mr. Kavanagh for explanation.

We now enclose a copy of his reply, and shall feel obliged by your transmitting to us any observation on that document which you may deem necessary to make, before Thursday next, so that they may be in time for Friday's Board.

We have, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

Rev. R. Sadleir, D. D.,
Castleknock.

Castleknock, 5 October 1857.
Monday Morning.

Gentlemen,

I have received your letter, dated Saturday the 3d, enclosing a copy of Mr. Kavanagh's reply to my former communication, and requesting me to transmit to you any observations on that document which I may deem necessary to make.

In reply, I beg leave to state that I have only two remarks to make relative to it; one is, that I must decline appearing as the prosecutor of, or even as a witness against Mr. Kavanagh.

I know nothing of that gentleman but what I have read in the public journals respecting his having advanced himself by own talents, and what I heard from the teachers of the Phœnix Park and Porterstown National Schools touching his late inspection.

From the former, I am greatly prejudiced in his favour, and therefore it was with considerable unwillingness and peculiar pain that I reported the latter to you.

Your Board, I should think, can know little of the real qualifications of their inspectors, unless the managers of schools report to you the mode in which the inspections are conducted, you have a right to expect that they will do so, if they consider it is conducted in a manner prejudicial to the interests of national education, and I think it would be a sad dereliction of duty on the part of a manager to withhold such information from you.

It was under this impression that I discharged what I felt to be a painful but imperative duty in reporting to you what the teachers reported to me.

Having done so, I do not consider it necessary to proceed further. The report is not mine, but theirs; and if it is questioned it is easy to examine the teachers, to ascertain its truth. If it turns out untrue or exaggerated, I shall rejoice on Mr. Kavanagh's account, although I shall deplore the teachers' want of veracity. All I can say upon the subject is, that I took down their reports in writing at the time, that I questioned them a few days afterwards, to be sure that I had not misrepresented their statements, that the reports relative to the extreme violence of his manner, &c. corresponded with each other, and that they never made an unfavourable report of an inspector before.

The only other observation which I think is necessary to make is this: it would appear from the last clause of his letter that the continuance of the grant to Porterstown was a personal favour to myself; and from its discontinuance being decided on the day my letter was read before the Board, it would seem that that act was meant as a retaliation for my having written such a letter.

Whether it was so intended or not, I can only say that I cannot accept it as such, and for this reason: I have incurred the greatest odium from my Protestant parishioners for having ever placed that school in connexion with the National Board, consequently I could not get a penny towards its support, except a few pounds from two individuals. A sense of duty, however, made me cheerfully bear the burthen of supporting that school, and enduring the hos-

tility of my flock, to secure for the children of all denominations in my parish united education, with separate religious instruction. As, however, the Roman-catholic parents have of late allowed themselves to be persuaded not to accept education of any kind in that school from a Protestant, though I also employed and paid, out of my own pocket, a Roman-catholic assistant (a deputation from the Roman-catholic clergy and laity of the parish avowed to me their intention to persuade them, unless I consented to dismiss the Protestant teacher, with whom they acknowledged they had no other fault). I see no necessity for provoking the displeasure of my flock any longer; and though I would not remove the school from under the Board, lest it should be supposed that I had ceased to be a friend to the cause of National Education, though assurances of their favour, and tempting offers of liberal support were held out to me, still I must confess that I rejoice that the Board has, by their own act, removed the apple of discord; and the long list of subscriptions to my new school, which now lies before me, and which is more than amply sufficient to support it, completely reconciles me to the change.

Thanking the Board for their kindness to the mistress of Porterstown School in giving her three months' notice of their intention to discontinue her salary, which was the only favour I ever meant to ask,

I am, &c.,
(signed) *Ralph Sadleir*, D.D.,
Sub-Dean of St. Patrick's, and Prebendary of Castleknock.

To Maurice Cross, Esq.,
James Kelly, Esq. } Secretaries.

(6/437/57.)

Office of National Education.
5 October 1857.

Sir,

We are to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this day, which we shall lay before the Commissioners of National Education.

With reference to your observations as to the striking off of the Porterstown Female School, we beg to say that the Board's order for withdrawing the grant of salary, &c. is dated the 11th September, but in the ordinary course of business was not communicated to you until the 25th, the day on which your letter respecting Mr. Kavanagh was laid before the Board; a coincidence which was purely accidental.

We have, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*,
James Kelly, } Secretaries.

The Rev. R. Sadleir, D.D.,
&c. &c. &c.
Castleknock.

Gentlemen,

Castleknock, 6 October 1857.

I have received your letter of yesterday, informing me that the discontinuance of the salary to Porterstown school was not decided on the day my complaint of Mr. Kavanagh was read, although the date on which I received the announcement might lead me to suppose that it was; and that, consequently, it could not have been intended as a retaliation for my having made the complaint.

I beg to say in reply that that explanation is satisfactory to me, and that I am glad to perceive that Mr. Kavanagh had not as much to do with the continuance or discontinuance of the salary, as his letter led me to suppose he had.

It has occurred to me since my last letter that, instead of confronting the teachers with Mr. Kavanagh, as I proposed, which might expose them hereafter to persecution, the fear of which might intimidate them to conceal the truth, the truth might be elicited as well by my producing my notes of their evidence, given to me in the school-room, and signed by themselves in presence

of

of each other. These, it is true they asked me, and I promised not to produce unless it was necessary to do so.

But if your Board considers it necessary and sufficient to see them, instead of the teachers, I, of course, shall not hesitate to produce them.

It has also occurred to me that the long interval between Mr. Kavanagh's visits, and my report of them to the Board, requires some explanation.

I therefore beg leave to explain that it arose from several causes, the principal of which was extreme reluctance on my part to get any one, particularly a person who had elevated himself so much as Mr. Kavanagh had by his own exertions, into trouble.

Besides, it was not until some time after I heard of his conduct at the Phœnix Park School that I learned from Mr. Cook, my curate, that he had acted improperly at Porterstown too, and left what he considered a most impertinent message there for him.

The pressing duties of an extensive parish caused some time to elapse before I could visit that school to inquire into his conduct there; the vacation, my own absence in the country, and the belief that the Board did not meet at that season of the year, caused a further delay.

As soon however as I thought it likely that the Board had resumed its sittings, and that I found a leisure hour, I found it necessary to ask the question, "Did the Board expect me to enter my name in the visitor's book at every visit?" and, when in the act of doing so, the question forced itself upon me, "Is it not a shameful dereliction of duty to leave the Board in ignorance of Mr. Kavanagh's highly improper conduct?" how can I expect the teachers to discharge their duties cheerfully if they are to be again exposed to such bullying, before all the children; and how can education be carried on, and proper discipline be observed in the schools, if inspectors are allowed to conduct themselves in this way?

The answer that my conscience gave was, that "it was my bounden duty to report to the Board what the teachers had reported to me."

Trusting that this explanation of the delay may be deemed satisfactory.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *R. Sadleir*, D.D.

To the Secretaries of the
National Board of Education.

(6437/57, 6477/57.—B. O. 16/10/57.)

Porterstown and Phœnix Park Schools.

Office of National Education,
27 October 1857.

Sir,

HAVING laid before the Commissioners of National Education your letters of the 5th and 6th instant, they direct us to request you will have the goodness to transmit to us, for the information of the Board, the statements of the teachers of the above schools respecting Mr. Kavanagh's conduct, as taken in writing by you and signed by them.

We have, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

The Rev. Dr. Sadleir,
&c. &c. &c.
Castleknock.

STATEMENT of TEACHERS, called for by Letter to Rev. Dr. *Sadleir*, dated 27 October 1857.

PORTERSTOWN SCHOOL.

MR. KAVANAGH visited this school on the 11th August. He came at 10 minutes before three o'clock, and remained till half-past four o'clock, when the carman said he would wait no longer. The children usually leave the school at a quarter before three; he kept them till four o'clock, and remained alone with me till half-past four o'clock.

He examined a class in a very rough, angry way, and would not give the children time to answer. They were very much frightened; some of them cried. None of them answered as well as they would answer to me and to Mr. Coyle.

He asked, "Did they read the Testament?" and when I told him "They did," he said, "There was no child there fit to read the Testament;" he said so in their hearing. Those he examined read very well; some of them are 12 years of age.

He told me to "tell Dr. Sadleir and Mr. Cooke to visit the school more frequently and regularly, and to enter their report." I told him Dr. Sadleir visited as often as he could, and that Mr. Cooke came nearly every week in place of Dr. Sadleir, who lives two miles away.

He was very rough in his manner to me; he asked several times, could he go up stairs, and seemed most pressing to do so. He frequently went out of the school-room to the foot of the stairs, as if to go up, though I told him it was my own private room.

When he found fault with anything, he would not listen to any explanation from me. He was very angry about the class rolls, which were kept correctly, as Mr. Coyle's reports testify, except that the ages were not mentioned. He was also very angry about the board outside, and said "he supposed I planted the tree to cover it." I said it was planted before my time. (She could not cut it without mounting on a ladder, and she had none.)

I have read the above, and it is true.

(signed) *Jane Sophia Briarly.*

When I returned to the school from town, shortly after Mr. Kavanagh had left, my daughter appeared greatly excited, and when I inquired the cause, she told me that Mr. Kavanagh had been there, and was so rude and rough in his manner, that she had been crying all the day.

(signed) *Catherine Briarly.*

Phœnix Park School.

Mr. Kavanagh came one day, at 8 o'clock a.m.; the school opens at half-past 10. On another day he came just as the children were going away.

He asked the children, on one occasion, to parse the word "God," &c.; the children were so terrified at his manner, and at being asked to parse such a sentence, they would not answer, though they were able to do so.

His manner to the mistress and assistant was most rude, correcting them frequently before all the children for their manner of teaching, and telling Miss Reynolds, on one occasion, not to presume to interfere, or he would leave the room.

She had to retire, she was so overcome by his violence and constant reproofs. The children were in a panic; they did not miss a word in geography, and still he wrote down an unfavourable report. One child said, after he went away, that only she was standing there as a scholar, she would have told him he was neither a gentleman nor a man to conduct himself as he had done.

He asked the assistant mistress to teach a class, and then informed her, before all the children, that she knew nothing about it, because she attempted to explain the word "love," which, if she attended his lecture, she would have known could not be explained.

The two mistresses think he came determined to find fault, because the school had not been organised as he wished it to be, and because they did not attend his lectures, which they could not attend, not having got the notice in time.

Mr. Coyle always wrote in the book that the reports were properly kept. He (Mr. Kavanagh) was outrageous at their being kept so, and made them be twice re-written, which kept her up two nights, to have them done in the limited time he gave for doing them. She thinks them objectionable in his new way, and that no teacher could keep them properly and attend to their school as they should.

Miss

Miss Reynolds told him Dr. Sadleir visited usually once a week; he asked were the children taught the Scriptures.

I have read the above, and it is quite true.

(signed) *M. J. Reynolds.*
Ellen A. Arnott.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 24 November 1857.

I BEG leave to request that Mr. Coyle may be examined before the committee now sitting in reference to Rev. Dr. Sadleir's teachers' statements, as he was present during the entire time spent by me on one of the two days that I examined Phœnix Park National School. The points that I wish him to be examined upon are —

1. State of the accounts in both of Dr. Sadleir's schools, and the charge made that he gave directions different from mine as to the keeping of them in Porterstown; the pains taken by me with Miss Reynolds on this head, and the extreme kindness and toleration shown towards her, in the face of great neglect.

2. My manner towards her on the occasion of our visit.

It appears to me that the simplest and fairest way to dispose of the case would be to send for the two teachers to the office, and let them be asked a few questions in the presence of Rev. Dr. Sadleir, Mr. Coyle, and me: I engage to dispose of it in 10 minutes.

I am, &c.

The Secretaries, (signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*
Education Office.

No. 1. (L.)

CORRESPONDENCE between the Commissioners of National Education, *Ireland*, and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools), relative to all the matters connected with himself, likely to engage the attention of the Board, from the 31st October 1857 to 29th January 1858.

Gentlemen, Grenville, Rathgar, 31 October 1857.

I BEG leave respectfully to submit for the serious consideration of the Commissioners the following statement in reference to the matters regarding me, which are likely to engage the attention of the Board.

I understand that in the early part of last month the Board appointed a committee of some of its members to consider some matters in relation to me, and on learning this I at once requested to be informed as to "the nature and detail of the several cases to be considered, in order that I may submit written explanations upon each" (letter 17/9/57): but was informed (B. O. 25/9/57) that, "if in the course of the inquiry they should find it necessary to call for any explanation in addition to what I have already furnished, they will give me due notice." From this it would appear that the committee was struck for certain specific subjects, upon all of which I had furnished some explanation, and it is only reasonable to suppose that these only would engage their attention.

I understand that the following are the four subjects :—

1st. The paper read by me at the late meeting of the British Association.

2d. The printed hand-bill advertising my book on arithmetic.

3d. Irregularity in the transmission of journals and replies to letters, and negligence last March, which imperilled, and well nigh ship-wrecked the scheme of organisation in Dublin.

4th. Complaints brought by me against two of the inspectors under me, Messrs. Fleming and Clarke; and correspondence with another inspector, Mr. Mahony, as to the restoration of a depressed teacher to his former rank.

I am not aware, nor can I ever imagine, that besides these there was any other charge or matter against me; and I have reason to believe that the last two were those only intended to be referred to the committee, as the grounds for the first two complaints arose while the others were pending.

First Charge.—As to the reading of the paper, I beg leave to refer you to my letter of the 10th ultimo, forwarding for the perusal of the Commissioners the very paper itself, and thereon I received an order (11/9/57) acknowledging same, and in this, the only official communication which I have received upon the subject, there is a total absence of censure. The advertisement respecting the paper, which was inserted in the "Saunders's News Letter" of the 14th ultimo by direction of the Commissioners, was published without calling on me for any explanation upon the matter; and not merely from my own personal friends, but from numbers of other influential parties I have received the expression of their sympathy for the painful position in which the Commissioners deemed it necessary to place me. I beg leave to refer the Board to my letter of the 17th ultimo, which, I trust, will satisfy them that not only I myself believed I was taking no irregular or improper step in reading the paper before the British Association, but that my superior officers were of the same opinion; or why knowing I was about to read it, not apprise me of any rule against it? Would Mr. Cross have specially left the office and hurry to hear me read the paper, if he knew of the existence of any rule against it. As the terms and object of the prohibition referred to in the newspaper advertisement, are likely not known to some of the Commissioners, as not one of the seven members who constituted the Board when the prohibition was issued now remains on the Commission, I beg leave to briefly state its origin. There were four inspectors appointed in May 1832, Messrs. Robertson, Sullivan, Hamil, and Murray. In a few months after, Mr. (now Dr.) Sullivan wrote a letter with his name attached to the "Northern Whig" newspaper, and some other articles without his name were inserted as editorial, and the letter having been brought under the notice of the Board, a resolution was passed 18th October 1832, stating that they had observed with regret Mr. Sullivan's published letter, and that it be notified to the inspectors and other officers of the Board, "that they are not to publish any letter or document relating to its proceedings, or to any theological or political subject, and that they are not to write any letter on the business of the Board, unless to them or by their direction."* This is the prohibition referred to in the Board's advertisement, and which leads the public to believe that it applies to the reading of my paper before the Association, and that I knowingly violated this prohibition. This letter to the four inspectors was issued when I was a schoolboy 25 years ago, it never was printed or embodied in the proceedings, much less in the rules of the Board, and I am now for the first time indebted for its precise terms to an expensive Parliamentary Report published 20 years ago. In 1836 the instructions to inspectors (Head III. § 3) in reference to this are that "they will carefully avoid permitting themselves to be drawn into political or theological discussions," and neither this nor the prohibition of 1832,† applies to the reading of my paper.

With reference to the arithmetic, my letters of the 6th and 12th instant, and 12th ultimo, prove that I merely followed the example and the uncensured and open practice of other authors in the Board's service, who in a friendly manner have for the last 17 years been seeking and applying the assistance of the inspectors to advertise, circulate, and promote the sale of their works; the important difference being that I was merely about to ask the inspectors to assist me, but had not done so when the handbill advertisement was censured. My property has been greatly injured and my feelings severely pained, whereas save the printing alone, all, and more than I intended to do, has been done through the central establishment by the professors. I beg leave to earnestly request a full consideration of this matter, and the three letters thereon, as already adverted to, in order to fully understand the extreme, the unprecedented severity with which I have been treated. I respectfully submit that no one can for

* Evidence before House of Commons, 10th May 1837, Q. 2852; also, Q. 2835 and 2843.

† It is a known maxim in law that prohibitions and penalties are to be interpreted literally, and privileges widely and generously.

for a moment doubt, from the open manner in which I printed and proposed to circulate those handbills, that I had no fear or apprehension that there was anything therein liable to censure by the Commissioners. And whilst I deeply regret the error of judgment committed in printing them, I feel bound, considering all the circumstances of the case, to express my opinion that the means taken to prevent the inspectors from lending me any friendly assistance which they might think fit, entirely exceeded that object. The prohibitory circular was the first communication which the inspectors had had upon the subject; and a letter to myself would have sufficiently served the end in view, and would have been implicitly obeyed by me.

The third complaint as to arrear in the transmission of journals, &c., I have disposed of in my letter of the 5th instant, and to the consideration of which I beg leave to respectfully refer the committee. I beg leave to remind you that during the months of March and April last I was in almost daily intercourse with the office and with my superiors, during the more active and early stages of the working of the scheme of organisation in Dublin; and during all that time I heard nothing but praise and approval of my untiring and successful efforts to advance the measure. Some time since I could not but be astonished on reading, as the ground of a serious charge prepared to be laid before the Commissioners that, owing to my neglect in not sending in a list of schools, and not calling on inspectors and managers, the whole scheme of organisation in Dublin had well nigh been shipwrecked, statements not only wholly unfounded, but never has officer in any service shown greater devotion to a cause or an end than I did to that, and its complete success was mainly effected by me.

The fourth charge, or rather matter for inquiry, I am much surprised to find so very long undecided. In January last I complained that Mr. Fleming, inspector of the Wicklow District, had salary withdrawn from a schoolmistress, upon the ground (amongst other reasons) of want of literary qualifications, without having examined her to test the fact, and the manager protesting against Mr. Fleming's opinion; again, without examining the teacher, Mr. Fleming recommends her continuance in the school. On the matter being referred to him, he does not deny the accuracy of the charge, but he turns round and brings various recriminatory complaints against me. In a letter dated 10th July last, I went into a full and detailed reply to Mr. Fleming's letters, and requested the Commissioners to investigate his conduct in the whole business. To this letter, and to two subsequent ones, dated July 28th and August 1st, I beg leave to request the attention of the Commissioners; and I beg to observe that I conceive it to be of the deepest importance to the order, subordination, and efficiency of the whole corps of inspection, that every statement and counter statement in the entire of the correspondence on both sides be fully examined, and their accuracy noted. The case of Mr. Clarke is somewhat similar. In the discharge of an ordinary routine duty, I had occasion to recommend the removal of some of the paid monitors in his district, and to complain of him in reference to matters connected with the monitorial staff. On this being referred to Mr. Clarke, he writes a long letter, to which I replied, 25th July, requesting that the whole matter should undergo full investigation. Besides this, I reported to the Commissioners, 10th April last, that this officer's note-books afford undoubted proof that, although he reports the full examination of the classes, he does not examine them in many instances, and I pointed out the grounds of this opinion in my letter. This charge was made before I was aware that Mr. Clarke had taken any exception to my former complaint against him. I understand that his relation to Dr. Newell, his present head inspector, is nearly similar to what it was to me. I am the more surprised at not hearing anything of the charge brought against Mr. Clarke, in my letter of 10th April, as he is an officer who has been frequently punished by the Commissioners, fined, depressed to the rank of sub-inspector, removed from various comfortable districts, &c.; and within the past few months I have seen it noted that, for several weeks together, no journals nor reports had been forwarded by him.

The third point under the 4th head, refers to the joint recommendation of Mr. Mahony and me, to have a teacher in Sligo, named Little, restored to first class, from which he had been depressed on Mr. Mahony's report. I beg to refer

refer you to my letter of 1st July, upon the matter. It was attempted to be shown that in making some observations upon the classification sheet, on which we recommended this teacher's restoration, I had acted with something like a design to commit Mr. Mahony to observations written by me after the sheet had received his signature, and been forwarded by him to me; my habits for nine years, as can be proved by the production of several classification sheets, whereon I acted similarly, the same practice doubtless with some of my colleagues, and the internal evidence of the matter written, apart altogether from my own sense of honour, supply sufficient answer to this imputation. The "classification or fine," "dismissal," "admonition," "promotion," are the only things that the two inspectors, head and district, sign, as being unanimous regarding them, the general points, or exceptional cases, like Little's, it is the duty of the head inspector to explain to the office. The observation on the classification sheet is in my handwriting, it is in different ink from the rest of the sheet, and it contains statements of and about Mr. Mahony, and by name twice, and not professing to be made by him in any way whatever. On examining Mr. Mahony's letter of 21st February, it will be found that he repeatedly states his opinion, that the punishment inflicted through his report was far too severe, and although he does not in express terms assent to the opinion stated by me "that he feared he would incur blame by so expressing himself to the office;" an examination of that letter cannot fail to satisfy any one that even on his own evidence, that was his real feeling. He also concurs with me that admonition should have been the punishment under the circumstances. I further beg leave to advert to the objectionable manner in which extracts are taken from reports upon that school, Kesh, and strung together so as to appear to be one connected paragraph, whereas read in their proper position, as answers to questions scattered over the reports, they lose the unfavourable character which they are made to derive from their now foreign and unrelated context. This and another serious error have been committed in reference to the reports of 21st April and 18th November of last year upon this school, and those in the hands of parties not technically acquainted with the matter, are calculated to produce impressions very different from what would result from the careful examination of the reports themselves.

Having now noticed the four heads which embraced the subjects in reference to which the committee has been appointed, I beg leave to request attention to the remarkable line of proceeding now being pursued respecting the case. The committee which was nominated early in September has not yet met; from time to time I have sent in letters of explanation in reference to the charges and matters which I had reason to know would be considered by them, and now I learn with the deepest surprise, that not alone are the Commissioners to consider these the only subjects intended when striking the committee, but in addition, an indictment extending over my whole life, since May 1834, is to be preferred against me. I beg leave to respectfully declare that I am unconscious of any act or conduct on my part which would call for such a proceeding, or which would render necessary such a departure from all my experience of public life. I cannot conceive how such adverse cumulative evidence, ranging over a period of at least 17 years, could now be used except to the prejudice of the party, as it is hopeless to expect that every case will be taken up, and its attendant circumstances reproduced *de novo*, as they appeared to the Board at the time it was investigated. I had been for some years labouring in the humbler ranks of the institution before any of the present Commissioners were appointed, 13 members are dead or have ceased to be on the Commission, to many of whom I was well known: and amongst the members appointed upon this committee, only two had been upon the Board when I had the honour to be appointed into the Board's own service. In making these statements which are material to a just and correct estimate of the fairness of the present proceedings, I am at the same time actuated with due and becoming respect to the Board, both as to the members who composed it, as well as in its collective capacity. The position in which I am placed by the course about to be adopted obliges me to briefly review my entire connexion with national education, a task irksome to any person of ordinary modesty, but I owe it to the dearest ties in life, as well as to myself, to request that the Commissioners will place it side by side with the sketch of that connexion which all the letters of disapprobation ever sent to me would suggest.

May

May 1834.—Appointed assistant teacher in a large National School, Newtown, County Carlow; age, 15 years. Up to that I had been taught in the then best and most respectable English school of a public character in Leinster. It was built by the townspeople and parishioners, had an annual endowment from Lady Dover and her family, and was attended by all classes and creeds, the sons of magistrates, professional men, &c.; and many of its pupils are clergymen in the Catholic Church, about 20, and in the Established Church a few. Some are doctors, some are engineers, many are in mercantile life, scores are teachers, two are over model schools, three rose to be inspectors, and the master himself, yet faithful to his post and duties, has realised in fee simple and personal property not less than 20,000 *l.* The Commissioners have no school in connexion with them that affords anything like the same amount of materials for humble history as does the famous school of Graignamanagh, which seven years before the Board was founded attracted to it boys from a circuit of 10 to 20 miles to lodge in the town, in order to partake of its advantages.

January 1837.—Appointed to the charge of Allen National School, County Kildare.

July 1837.—Appointed to Monasterevan National School, same county. While here, between three to four private tuitions, and my school income. I was worth, for a great portion of the time, over 100 *l.* a year. Placed on first class in 1839, when only 20 years of age, but not having been trained, placed on second class only. Desired to be trained, but manager refused, as he said mine was a model school. Mr. Corballis is not likely to forget his examination of it in 1839 or 1840. Returned for training, at my request to inspector, and summoned, but manager refused.

August 1840.—Inspector, at my request, had me again summoned for training, and on intimating that I would resign if the manager did not permit me to attend, I was allowed to go to Dublin. Spent a few weeks only in the training department. While there, my attainments and conduct won for me the record which you will find in the official registry, a record by the professors such as nowhere else appears in the case of thousands of teachers who have passed through the training department.

September 1840.—Was appointed master of the Tullamore National School. In December Professor Sullivan wrote me a very kindly and flattering note, intimating that I had been "placed on the first division of first class, a rank which I pre-eminently merited."

January 1841.—Appointed head teacher of the Male Model Schools, Marlborough-street.

This closes my life as an ordinary school teacher, and I may be permitted to observe, that in the case of three of the four situations which I had filled I was solicited to accept the place; the same in the fourth, but it was after examination; and in the period of four years that I had had charge of a school, and of the entire 6 or 6 ¾ years that I had been teaching, I never received a word of censure from managers, inspectors, or Commissioners.

The Commissioners, with thousands of masters in their service, altogether unsolicited by me, called another teacher, Mr. Bohun, who afterwards became professor of mathematics in Oscott College, and myself, before them, and I had the honour to be selected, when only 22 years of age, for the important post of head of their boys' model schools.

For nearly four years I laboured in these schools under the eyes of the Commissioners, and during that period I regret that a foolish and driftless act of levity—jumping up on a wall in Glasnevin, committed 16 years ago, when a very young man—brought me some blame. For some time before I left, in the winter in 1844, my relations to the professors and Mr. Rintoul were not good, which gave trouble, which I must now regret; but I believe both parties would now admit there were faults on both sides, as is proved by the Commissioners' decision to remove me from the model schools and appoint me inspector, which I desired.

December 1844.—Appointed Inspector in the Virginia District, County Cavan.

During the two years that I was in charge of this district not the slightest

incident unfavourable to me occurred. I instituted monthly meetings of my teachers, at which I instructed them; I got up a circulating library for their use; I printed a programme of the qualifications required for their classification; and I held term examinations of the teachers at convenient points in the district; I stimulated managers as well as teachers; got 100, and in two years gave up over 150, National Schools, and brought round to the National system several Protestant clergymen and laymen in my district, as Archdeacon Stopford and Sir John Young.

December 1846.—Wholly unsolicited on my part I was not even aware that such appointments were about to be made; the Commissioners were pleased to nominate me, with Mr. M'Creedy, for the two new head inspectorships.

When the Commissioners did me the honour to select me for the important office which I have now held for 11 years, there were 34 district inspectors, and 18 of us were Roman Catholics. I was then only 28 years of age, and had served but two years in charge of a district. All my co-religionists were my seniors in service, and not only all in years, but most of them very much so; and several of them had many special advantages over me. Notwithstanding, the Commissioners, viewing all these facts, were pleased to select me as fittest for the duty; and although this must have been their main and primary object, I felt, and feel deeply grateful for the over-kind estimate which they set upon any little merit which they may have noticed in me, and especially so to some members of the Board who were then in the habit of treating me with a kindness almost fatherly.

If I had been guilty of any serious fault up to December 1846, surely, unless the then Commissioners were firmly convinced that it should be forgotten in my subsequent life, they would never have conferred upon me so important and honourable an office. When called before the Board to receive my appointment, the Resident Commissioner and Mr. Cross doubtless recollect the high compliments paid to me by His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, and the hope that he expressed that, youthful as I was, the Board had seen enough of my past life to warrant them in so raising me over others.

Trusting that I have now fully disposed of the history of my official career from the threshold of the school when I left it as a pupil up to my appointment 12 years after as Head Inspector; I beg leave to refer the Commissioners to my first six years of service as Head Inspector, that is, from January 1847 to January 1853.

1847 to 1853.—The examination of teachers, the inspection of ordinary schools, and the direction of the new district models, were the chief objects which engaged the Head Inspectors during these six years. During most part of this time I had charge of Munster and a portion of Connaught; and as the famine deranged the social condition of that country for some years, the discharge of my duties required peculiar tact and firmness. It will be seen that had I not the courage to resist the appointment of incompetent teachers, of whom I dismissed more than almost my three colleagues taken together, our schools would have degenerated into hedge schools, during and after the years of distress. This was so done that I now scarcely recollect even one instance of dispute or protracted correspondence with the managers, or with the office, upon the subject. I inspected many hundred schools in that circuit, and I have no recollection of more than two cases, Goresbridge and Kilkee, in which my six years' labours caused the slightest trouble, and in these two the Board's decision was against the complaining parties. The District Model Schools under my direction were worked up to a state of efficiency which attracted marked public notice. Clonmel was the most attractive in Ireland, and Dunmanway became the first of all those in smaller towns. The success of Clonmel produced those in Kilkenny, Waterford, and Limerick, all of which were ordered to be built, and sites selected for them while in my charge. My able and gifted friend, Dr. Clarke, by my encouragement and support, worked with me until by my reports and exertions in his favour, the Commissioners created the department of physical science, the first great and comprehensive scheme of general object-lessons attempted under the national system, a scheme which mainly led to the formation of the depôt for material aids for instruction, and which has suggested various improvements in teaching.

My

My general reports for these six years were frequently quoted in the press, here and in England. My report on the examination of teachers in 1848, showing the injurious effects of the distribution of relief in the schools, obtained wide circulation, and the 5th section of the Commissioner's Report (15th) for that year, notices the opinions stated in it; my general reports on model schools were also much noticed; my report on the schools inspected by me in the south and west, is even now referred to; whilst a special report by me upon the best means of establishing nautical or maritime schools (Appendix, 18th Report, 1851) under the Board, had the honour of being made the subject of a special paragraph in the text of the Commissioners' Report for that year; and in consideration of its valuable matter, a special grant of 20*l.* was voted to me by the Board.

During the six years, I never received, so far as I can recollect, one letter of serious reproof or reprimand; there may have been some of a routine character merely, but none of a nature involving personal blame to me in reference to my official life and actions. I never made a complaint worth notice; two trifling ones against an inspector in connexion with me; and Mr. Cross can testify as to the popularity which I enjoyed amongst all classes, as witnessed in his tour through my circuit in November 1851. Through the clergy of my own church, I was frequently enabled to settle differences of a serious character which often obstructed the practical working of the National system, as in the case of the several schools on the Earl of Bessborough's estate, and also in the case of Dunmanway Model, Glandore, and Gormanstown schools. And I enjoyed the confidence and respect of all the Protestant clergy favourable to the Board, as the then Bishop of Limerick, Dean Hoare, the Presbyterian clergy in Clonmel and Limerick, &c. Nor was this confidence confined to the National Schools, as you are aware that application was made to the Board to send me down to specially examine Archdeacon Stopford's Schools in Kells, and the Oldcastle Endowed Schools; and in these and the Leamy Schools, Limerick, votes of thanks were passed to me for the manner in which I had conducted the examinations or for the practical reports which I had made upon the institutions. To enumerate the persons of property in my circuit who were favourable to me would be to name nearly all of them who supported the system: Marquis of Headfort, Earl of Bessborough, Earl of Clare, Lord Monteagle, Sir John Young, Earl of Clifden, Mr. Monsell, Earl of Kenmare, Mr. Tighe, Marquis of Westmeath, Lady Osborne, Mr. Bagwell, &c., &c.

Before closing this brief account of these six important years of my life, I may be pardoned for questioning the fairness of now bringing forward an aggregate of routine letters forwarded to me during that period. They are the usual letters to be expected with most public officers; and if then bringing no blame, and many of them may have been unnecessary, or may have been explained, why bring these forward now? When the activity and energy of my official life during these six years are considered, I have no fear whatsoever that when the circumstances are considered, the faintest shade can be justly cast upon my official reputation by the anomalous proceeding of now stringing together all the letters, routine and otherwise, then forwarded to me.

1853 to 1857.—1st July 1852. His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, who from the first had been exceedingly kind, and most favourable to me, visited, at my suggestion and attended by me, the Clonmel District Model Schools. This visit and its consequences led to the protracted discussion which ended in the retirement of his Grace and two other distinguished members from the Board in 1853.

In January 1853, the Commissioners, without any suggestion on my part, directly or indirectly, ordered that I should enter upon a special examination of the workhouse and prison schools throughout Ireland. From the moment that I entered upon this duty, it was quite evident that the Poor Law Commissioners were wholly and determinedly hostile to the inquiry instituted. During 1853, and the early part of 1854, I was engaged on the workhouse schools through the greater part of Ireland; and looking back on the matter, I am greatly surprised, jealously watched as I was by a hostile commission and its large staff, and liable to come into contact with such a number of Boards of Guardians, that in one instance only, Galway, did any difference with the guardians arise during my tour of inspection. Another dispute, in reference to

favourable observations left by me in the ordinary visitors' book in Ballymoney workhouse, occurred; the Board of Guardians was in my favour, the Poor Law Commissioners against me; and the written evidence of the master of the workhouse established the substantial inaccuracy of the statements made by the Poor Law Commissioners.

In February 1854 the Committee of the House of Lords was appointed to inquire into the practical working of the system of national education in Ireland, and with the exception of Mr. Cross, whose position as secretary obliged his earlier attendance, I was the first officer summoned for examination. Upon the main question which led to the inquiry I believe my testimony was that which, in a great measure, determined the entire regularity and justice of the steps taken at the opening of the Clonmel, and previously in the Newry Model School, and I had the honour to receive the warmest complimentary letters from the Earl of Granville, Chairman, from Lord Monteagle, and from the Earl of Fingall, upon my evidence; and the Earl of Harrowby to many persons, and the Right Reverend the Bishop of Ossory, in the committee room, complimented me on the manly and clear manner in which I gave my testimony. The close of that inquiry came, and brought with it enmities to me for the conscientious part that I had taken in it, which are not likely soon to be abated. The conduct of parties at the reading of my paper before the British Association, and the representation made to the Commissioners that it was believed that I was sent there by them to read that paper, furnish ample evidence that such enmity is not dormant.*

In the autumn of 1854 my general report on workhouse schools was published, with the entire sanction of and after careful revision by the Commissioners. In fact, before it was regularly published, it was attacked by the Poor Law Commissioners in two letters to the Lord Lieutenant. Three years have elapsed since that time, and it yet remains for any person to come forward and prove on the face of that report, the most minute as well as the most general ever published in any country upon the subject, a material error in the statement of facts, or one wrong opinion deduced from the information brought forward. I drew up my vindication of my report, my Board printed it, and the Commissioners disapproving of it, but requesting me to comprise it within a few, five or six I think, pages, when they would consider the propriety of publishing it. I at once declined such a proposition, as the two letters of the Poor Law Commissioners, containing thousands of detailed statements, extend over eighty closely printed pages of their Eighth Annual Report. I had my own honour and that of my colleagues to defend. I was convinced that, within the same compass, so great a mass of misrepresentation had never in a public document before come under my notice as that within the two letters of the Poor Law Commissioners, and confident in my position, and that truth, humanity, and justice were on my side, I confess I acted with the warmth which these feelings naturally inspired me.

For many years the Commissioners had been calling special attention in their reports to the condition and importance of the workhouse schools; my general report is flatteringly referred to in the text of their own report for 1853, but from that to this no practical step whatever has been taken to realise any of the suggestions contained in it. The Eighth Report of the Poor Law Commissioners describes my report as a mass of gross misrepresentation, the accuracy, if not the actual veracity of at least 20 of our inspectors is openly impugned; and as I could not realise an impossible problem to reply within the compass of a few pages to detailed mis-statements extending over 80, my colleagues and myself have been, and are still in an official public pillory, placarded as conspirators against truth. In declining to publish the vindication of my report,

* About this time one of the principal officers in the establishment, Mr. Charles Robertson, in my absence, and without previous misunderstanding of any kind between us, made a most unwarranted attack upon my character in the public office, which, on being made known to me by friends, I at once reported to the Commissioners. The Resident Commissioner and Mr. Cross both interposed, and at their urgent request I allowed the matter to drop, accepting Mr. Robertson's written apology as dictated by Mr. Cross, and on condition that the correspondence should be registered officially. I should not now refer to this matter, but that as one of the clerks, Mr. Stokes, was understood by me as having taken part in the above offence, I rebuked him therefore, and this may possibly be referred to in the official correspondence for this period.

report, it was open to the Commissioners to protect the honour of their officers by the insertion in their proceedings for 1854, of an expression of confidence in the accuracy of the matter submitted to them, but no such step has been taken. From 1854 to this, every day's experience has but added to the testimony in support of the importance of my report. A motion was founded upon it in the House of Commons by a late Poor Law Commissioner. Judges have quoted from it on the bench, and were I now to call witnesses to testify as to its accuracy, in points most assailed, some of these would be the Right honourable the Recorder, the Lord Chief Baron, the Emigration and the Poor Law Commissioners. The statement this day made by the Lord Chief Baron, in passing sentence upon nine young women, eight of whom were born and all brought up in the South Dublin workhouse, is more suggestively severe as to exposure of the workhouse system than anything in my report; and in a convict prison (Newgate), convenient to where his Lordship presided, there are now eight out of its 63 female inmates under penal servitude, all of whom had been brought up in the same workhouse.

I felt disappointed that any departmental jealousies should be permitted to prevent or postpone some remedial measure for a notorious and proven unsoundness, in reference to a numerous and important portion of our fellow-creatures, and I felt deeply pained and mortified at the manner in which I had been treated in the whole business. These feelings are sufficient to explain every unpleasant letter which passed between the Commissioners and me, in reference to the Poor Law question, extending from the summer of 1853 to the spring of 1855. These letters, which I request may be kept distinct and separate from all others, are exceptional, and as no officer that has ever been in the service of the Board has had any such duty in kind or degree assigned to him, the Commissioners will, I am sure, regard all the transactions arising out of it, as distinctive, and apart altogether from those in relation to my ordinary duties as Head Inspector. I regretted deeply, and often so expressed myself, that any difference of opinion has arisen upon the workhouse question, and I regarded the whole matter closed, so far as my relation to them is concerned, nor can I understand why the matter should now be revived. Whilst my opinions upon that important question have not undergone any modification whatever, I confess that the strength of my convictions and disappointment felt at the unexpected attitude which the Commissioners assumed in relation to it, sometimes led me into warmth of language which, on more mature consideration I regretted, but beyond this there was nothing in the whole of that unfortunate controversy, not entirely compatible with the most sincere respect and deference towards the Commissioners.

In the spring of 1855 I threw myself heartily into the working up of the arrear in the inspection office, and gave a generous support to my colleagues in framing the new measures for the improvement of the whole inspection department in all its branches. Unfortunately, very serious differences of opinion gradually arose in 1855 between the five head inspectors, on the one side, and the management of the inspection branch of the office on the other, and which led to unpleasant feelings and painful controversy. In this I had my own part in common with every one of my four colleagues. I shared in the painful steps which led to the course of action which we unanimously adopted, and I suffered in the common punishment inflicted upon us. It appears that we adopted an improper mode of correcting defects daily felt by us, but I am sure every one of my colleagues can cordially join me in the declaration that nothing could be more foreign to our object than a desire to act in any way which we believed would be disrespectful to the Commissioners.

In 1856 and this year, I devoted a large share of attention to the state of the schools in the metropolis and suburbs, the first time that they had undergone examination by a head inspector. Their condition was so very bad that the description which I gave of one of them was censured, but the visit which the resident Commissioner paid to that school when organised by me, or under me, will serve to show whether strong expressions of surprise were not somewhat excusable under the circumstances. I have, with Mr. Coyle's assistance, had almost every school—those at convents excepted—on the north side of the city and its suburbs, organised and improved, and several of the managers, as Very Rev. Dr. Gore, Archdeacon Hamilton, and Rev. Mr. M'Namara, have incurred heavy expenses, in order to carry out our views of improvement. In

fact, we have completely changed the internal aspect of the schools, and, without exception, we had the entire body of the managers co-operating with us in effecting this desirable end. Similarly in Drogheda, I have, with the sanction of his Grace Archbishop Dixon, had the schools in the town and vicinity improved.

No officer in the Board's service has contributed so largely as I have to adapt the National system to the peculiar wants and feelings of the country, and my experience of its practical working and knowledge of the condition of the schools over Ireland generally, are more extensive than those acquired by any other person in the institution. Differences of opinion upon matters affecting the system in its practical working, and occasional controversies, are inseparable from a life spent as mine has been for the last 17 years, and when the circumstances are all considered, my official life during that period has been as free from them as that of most officers similarly circumstanced. The position in which I was placed at the inquiry before the House of Lords, and in the workhouse controversy, are exceptional, and both made different classes of enemies for me. For the past few months marked hostility has openly been exhibited against me in quarters which I deplore, without provocation, and often upon alleged grounds which had no foundation. After 24 years' service such as I have sketched, a committee is appointed to sit upon and consider my official actions, as if I had been guilty of any moral or seriously official neglect or delinquency, without any order of the Board, and shifting the grounds of controversy according as the strength of my position was ascertained by my letters, the entire of any unfavourable correspondence from the Commissioners to me, but not the counterpart replies from me to them, is raked up from the whole establishment; a proceeding which, if generally acted on in any department of life, private or official, would leave existence joyless and insecure. Although I have fully noticed the leading points in my life as a reply to this indictment, I solemnly but most respectfully protest against it as contrary to every principle of moral and judicial action; and I appeal to the learned judges, lawyers, and gentlemen upon the committee to object *in limine* to the reception of such evidence, as destructive of all impartial inquiry. Not merely my elevation to the high office which I hold, and the efficiency and discretion with which for six years, up to 1853, I discharged its duties, but the repeated compliments, not to say honours, awarded to me during my life up to that date, blot out any antecedent blame which I had incurred. Even now, let any such blame be gathered into one collection, and there is nothing in it to excite one feeling of uneasiness on my part.

I have to humbly and sincerely pray that the circumstance in which I am placed may be deemed sufficient apology for the length of this communication, and for the trouble which this whole proceeding is causing; and I beg leave to assure the Commissioners, that at no previous period of my life had I been labouring with more zeal, more fidelity, or with more watchful anxiety, to meet the views and wishes of those in authority over me than at the time when this hostile proceeding against me was commenced.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh*,
Head Inspector.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 13 November 1857.

I BEG leave to request that on the assembling of the special committee of to-morrow, you will submit this letter for the consideration of the Commissioners, before the committee enters upon the general business assigned.

1. I respectfully claim, if not the right at least the privilege to be present at the sittings of the committee, in order to take notes and watch the proceedings, but not to speak or interfere unless called upon or permitted, and only at so much of the proceedings as are purely of the nature of an investigation.

2. Two months having been devoted since the appointment of the committee to the preparation of official and other documents connected with this case, and as I have received very little information as to the precise matters to be brought forward,

forward, I shall expect that should any serious case arise demanding the collection of evidence on my part, such portion of the inquiry will be postponed, in order to enable me to meet it.

3. As many points in the inquiry must necessarily turn upon technical interpretations and official practices, with which few of the Commissioners can be supposed to be familiar, I trust that reference will, in every such case, be made to me, as well as to those charged with conducting the inquiry, and this furnishes an additional ground for my presence during the investigation.

4. For the reasons stated in my letter of 31st ultimo, I beg leave to request that a decision be made *in limine*, as to the rejection of the partial evidence of my 23 years' public service, as indicated by unsatisfactory letters only, but I wish it to be distinctly understood that I have not the slightest objection to even this anomalous proceeding, if these letters be examined in connexion with my whole life and services.

5. The matters purely personal to myself, to be submitted to the committee are very few, three or four at most, and I request that these should be separated altogether from the other matters, such as the cases of Messrs. Clarke, Fleming, and Mahoney, reports upon Ballindine, Porterstown and Phœnix Park Schools, &c. which are commonly decided upon by the ordinary Board, and are rather complaints made by me against others, and not charges against myself.

I shall be in attendance in the office, awaiting the decision of the committee as to the first point herein put forward.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh*,
Head Inspector.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

P.S.—On consideration, I deem it better to refer this letter to the Board of this day, and I beg you will lay it before them. *J. W. K.*

(B. O. 13/11/57.)

Office of National Education,
13 November 1857.

Sir,

We have laid before the Commissioners of National Education, at their meeting to-day, your letter of this date.

The Commissioners cannot refrain from observing that they regard the tone and language of your letter as most offensive and insubordinate.

It will, however, be referred to the committee to which you allude, who will exercise their entire discretion as to the occasions and purposes for which they will require or admit your personal attendance before them, and the manner of conducting their investigations.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, *James Kelly*, } Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.
Head Inspector of National Schools.

Office of National Education,
14 November 1857.

Sir,

In accordance with the order of the Board, yesterday, we have this day laid before the committee your letter of the 13th instant, in which you say:

"I respectfully claim, if not the right at least the privilege to be present at the sittings of the committee, in order to take notes and watch the proceedings, but not to speak or interfere unless called upon or permitted, and only at so much of the proceedings as are purely of the nature of an investigation."

In reply, we are directed to inform you, that the committee decline to accede to your application. If your personal attendance be deemed necessary for any purpose whatsoever, you will be sent for; and you are therefore to remain in town until further instructions.

We are, &c
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, *James Kelly*, } Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.
Head Inspector, Rathgar.

Gentlemen, Grenville, Rathgar, 16 January 1858.

I REQUEST you will be pleased to submit this letter to the consideration of the Board of National Education as soon as convenient.

1. About a year since (31/1/57), I felt it my duty to submit a complaint of a serious nature against Mr. Fleming, one of the district inspectors then connected with me, and it would appear that this complaint was referred to Mr. Fleming for explanation, March 2d. His remarks thereon, contained in two communications dated April 24th and May 29th, were forwarded to me by order of the Resident Commissioner, July 3d; and on the 10th of that month I submitted, in compliance with that order, a full and detailed comment upon, not merely the statements made by Mr. Fleming, pertinent to my original complaint against him, but also upon a number of wholly irrelevant points contained in his two letters.

For the past six months I have heard nothing respecting this case, although I closed my letter of July 10th, with the following:—"I request the decision of the Commissioners on two distinct points, viz. Mr. Fleming's conduct in not examining Mary Murray, and secondly, the truth of the allegations which he puts forth in his letters, the serious matter here stated in my reply, and his general conduct on the whole business." I now beg leave to repeat this request, and to point out the importance not merely to me personally, but to the subordination and police discipline of the service, apart altogether from the protection due by the Commissioners to the National teachers, of deciding the two questions involved.

2. January 3d 1857. I sent in my recommendations as to the paid monitors in Mr. Fleming's District (No. 35): March 10th. Some of these were intimated to Mr. Fleming; and in a letter of May 9th, he stated in reference thereto, that some of my opinions were quite unwarranted, and at variance with those previously expressed by me, and by order of the resident Commissioner, I was called on to reply to that communication, which I did in my letters of July 28th, and August 1st.

It is now nearly six months since I forwarded these letters, and I beg leave to request that the case may be decided on, as the statements on both sides are of the most conflicting character, and involve the official, to say the least, reputation of the parties implicated.

3. January 21st 1857, in the discharge of a prescribed routine duty, I wrote to the Commissioners expressing my disapproval of a novel scheme in reference to paid monitors, adopted in the Wexford District by the inspector, Mr. H. P. Clarke. This separated the literary tuition from the training as monitors of these young persons, and proposed to deprive the two Convent National Schools in Wexford of the gratuities to which they might, in common with all schools, be entitled for the training of their staff of monitors. My letter of January 21st was referred to Mr. Clarke, March 3d, and he replied thereto, by a communication dated March 11th. On learning that his letter was the subject of general conversation unfavourable to me in official circles, and that great delay arose in transmitting it for my explanation, I at last applied, April 29th, to have it referred to me, and which was done by Board's order (1/5/57) in Secretary's letter of May 4th. In my reply, dated July 25th, I concluded by requesting the Commissioners "to decide as to the conduct pursued by Mr. Clarke in this whole matter."

Six months have since elapsed, and although Mr. Clarke's conduct has meantime been under consideration, and which has led to his depression a second time from the rank of district to that of sub-inspector, this important case has not been brought up, nor, as far as I know, has it received any attention whatever; and whilst the moral and official integrity of either him or me was involved in this case, which was altogether excluded at his trial some two months past, I may call attention to the fact, that in a memorandum from the inspection office (24/7/57) a charge is brought against me for the mere delay, fully explained, in replying to Mr. Clarke's letter of March 11th, upon the subject, and, further that this memorandum was one of the four points upon which the very adverse decision of the Board (27/11/57) against me was founded.

I now

I now pray that that the matter may be submitted to the Board, and their decision thereon communicated to me.

4. April 10th, 1857, in compliance with a regulation in the inspectors' code, and with special circular adverting to same, I reported as to the manner in which the several (six) official records of each of the ten districts in my circuit, were kept by the inspectors. In my report upon the records of Mr. H. P. Clarke's district, amongst other grave matters, I was obliged to state that "The numbers" (in inspectors' note-books) "which record the proficiency" (of the pupils said to be examined), "are not entitled to reliance, as the numerous and manifest coincidences between the numbers in certain classes and branches, and the numbers said to have answered satisfactorily in them are so glaring, and so contradict all that we know of the state of the schools" (generally in Ireland) "that experience must reject them as not reliable. Annexed I give" (list given with my letter) "the names of the 81 schools, and to 40 of the more obvious cases of these coincidences I have prefixed an asterisk that the details may be referred to and examined in the inspectors' note-books." I may add that I sent, rather handed, in the two note-books to the inspection department.

In the nine months since I sent in this most serious charge, I have not heard that any action has been taken upon it, or inquiry made respecting it, although this officer's conduct was meantime the subject of investigation by the Board, and which, as already stated, led to his depression a second time from the rank of district, to that of sub-inspector; and whilst this grave charge remains without notice or inquiry, so far as I know, I may be permitted to refer to the fact that three letters were written to me in a fortnight, just after the death of a near relative, calling on me for explanation as to my report upon another officer's (Mr. O'Carroll's) records, and the delay in forwarding that explanation has actually been included in a few matters of routine which form one of the four points upon which the recent order of the Board, depriving me of my situation as head inspector, was founded. Some of my colleagues have never made any reports upon the state of the district records, and they have escaped all blame; I strictly complied with the instructions, and no action is taken upon any of the serious abuses which my report set forth. Instead, the delay in explaining as to the report upon one district, already referred to, has been put forward as a ground for depriving me of my position.

5. Lastly, Rev. Dr. Sadlier, manager of two national schools, brought a complaint, consequent upon statements made to him by his teachers, against me in a letter, dated 21st September 1857, and which I was called upon to explain by an order of the Commissioners communicated in your letter of 26th September. To this, I replied in my letter of 27th September, but I understand that Dr. Sadlier has since sent in a second letter, containing statements from the teachers merely; and in my letter of 24th November, I suggested that Mr. Coyle, the teachers, and myself, should be examined in the office, Dr. Sadlier also being present, I beg leave to request that the Commissioners may also decide this case.

I have, &c.

The Secretaries, Education Office, Marlboro'-street. (signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board, dated 29th January 1858.

READ letter from Mr. J. W. Kavanagh, dated 16th instant, calling attention to the following cases in which he is concerned, and which have not yet been dealt with by the Board, and requesting that the Commissioners will come to an early decision thereon, viz.:—

1. Complaint against Mr. Fleming, district inspector.

2. Complaint in reference to conduct of Mr. Clarke, sub-inspector, and to the manner in which his official records are kept.

 3. Statement

3. Statement of the Rev. Dr. Sadlier regarding his (Mr. K.'s) visits to the Porterstown and Phœnix Park National Schools.

Ordered, that a committee of the Board, consisting of Robert Andrews, Esq., LL. D., M. Longfield, Esq., LL.D., and the Right Hon. A. Macdonnell, be appointed to examine and report upon the cases in relation to Mr. Kavanagh not yet investigated.

No. 1 (M).

CORRESPONDENCE between the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools) and with *Robert Sullivan*, LL.D., Superintendent of the Training Department, relative to a statement made by Dr. *R. Sullivan*, that Mr. *Kavanagh* had conspired with Mr. *Sheehy* to act in such a manner towards Dr. *Sullivan* as would compel him to resign his situation. From 11th November 1857, to the 19th of December 1857.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 11 November 1857.

I BEG leave to request that you will submit, for the consideration of the Board, at its earliest meeting, the following communication:—

I have been informed that on yesterday a letter was read to the Commissioners from Dr. Sullivan, charging Mr. Sheehy with insubordination, and amongst other references to me in that letter, Dr. Sullivan charges me with having conspired with Mr. Sheehy to act in such a manner towards Dr. Sullivan as would compel him (Dr. S.) to resign his professorship.

I beg to assure the Commissioners that this charge is wholly unfounded, and the statement untrue in every sense, general and particular, in which it is possible to make it. I, therefore, request that the Commissioners will be pleased to call upon Dr. Sullivan to bring forward any evidence he may be able, which would warrant him in deliberately preferring the charge of conspiracy against me. Not only must he fail to produce any such reliable evidence, but I pledge myself to completely refute the entire charge, and further to prove that Dr. Sullivan's own conduct and acts in relation to me, up to the past month, were wholly incompatible with his believing the charge which he now advances.

It was also suggested that the letter lately written by Dr. Clarke, in reference to a complaint brought against his assistant, and for which Dr. Clarke was censured, must have been concocted, or that he must have been instigated to write it by some other party. Coupling this insinuation with the charge openly made by Dr. Sullivan, I feel bound to state that by hint, conversation, writing, message, or through any means whatever, I had no knowledge of that letter, that I never saw Dr. Clarke, nor did I write to him pending the question, and that directly or indirectly I had no connexion with that gentleman in this matter.

I remain, &c.

The Secretaries, Education Office. (signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

(B. O. 13/11/57.)

Office of National Education,

Sir, 16 November 1857.

WE are directed by the Commissioners of National Education to transmit to you the following extract from a letter received from Head Inspector J. W. Kavanagh, dated the 11th instant:

"I have been informed that on yesterday a letter was read to the Commissioners from Dr. Sullivan, charging Mr. Sheehy with insubordination, and amongst other references to me in that letter, Dr. Sullivan charges me with having conspired with Mr. Sheehy to act in such a manner towards Dr. Sullivan as would compel him (Dr. S.) to resign his professorship."

The

The passage in your letter to which Mr. Kavanagh alludes, is as follows:

"I must add that Mr. Sheehy's conduct seems inexplicable, unless it is viewed in the light which I and many others do. I am quite convinced that there has been, for a considerable time, a deep design on the part of Mr. Kavanagh and Mr. Sheehy to drive me to resign."

The Commissioners request you will favour them, without delay, with any explanation or observations you have to offer on the subject.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,*
James Kelly, } Secretaries.

Dr. Sullivan,
Training Department.

Education Office, Training Department,
17 November 1857.

Gentlemen,

I HAVE received your letter of yesterday in which you, on the part of the Commissioners of National Education, request me to favour you with any explanation or observations I may have to offer on the following extract from a letter addressed to you by Mr. Kavanagh, head inspector, on the 11th instant.

"I have been informed that on yesterday a letter was read to the Commissioners from Dr. Sullivan, charging Mr. Sheehy with insubordination, and amongst other references to me in that letter, Dr. Sullivan charges me with having conspired with Mr. Sheehy to act in such a manner towards Dr. Sullivan as would compel him (Dr. Sullivan) to resign his professorship."

You also add, "The passage in your letter to which Mr. Kavanagh alludes is as follows:

"'I must add that Mr. Sheehy's conduct seems inexplicable, unless it is viewed in the light which I and many others do. I am quite convinced that there has been for a considerable time a deep design on the part of Mr. Kavanagh and Mr. Sheehy to drive me to resign.'"

In reply to your communication I think it sufficient to say that in the letter referred to I stated the grounds which led me to form this opinion regarding Mr. Kavanagh, namely, overt acts of his which I officially complained of in a letter, dated the 24th of April last; and as additional grounds for the opinion which I expressed, I beg to refer to his own letter to the Board on the subject of what he was pleased to consider as defects in the department under my charge, and also to Mr. Rintoul's official letter in reply to his statement, dated the 12th June last.

I am, &c.
(signed) *Robt. Sullivan.*

The Secretaries.

(B. O. 4/12/57.)

Education Office, 12 December 1857.

Sir,

YOUR letter of the 11th ultimo, regarding a statement made by Dr. Sullivan, that he suspected you and Mr. Sheehy of conspiring against him for the purpose of compelling him to resign his professorship, having been laid before the Board, we are to state, that whatever occasion Doctor Sullivan may have had to suppose that a design existed on the part of you and Mr. Sheehy to force him to resign, the Commissioners regret that he should have given expression to that conviction without having had means of positive proof.

We are, &c.
(signed) *M. Cross,*
J. Kelly, } Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.
&c. &c.

Gentlemen, Education Office, 14 December 1857.

I BEG to acknowledge the receipt of the order of the Board of the 4th inst., communicated in your letter of the 12th instant, and in reference thereto I beg leave to request that you will furnish me with the full and precise extract from Dr. Sullivan's letter in which he charged me with a deep design, in conjunction with Mr. Sheehy, to force him to resign his professorship.

I am, &c.

The Secretaries, Education Office. (signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

(B. O., 18/12/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 19 December 1857.

WE have laid before the Commissioners of National Education your letter of the 14th instant, in which you make the following request:—"That you will furnish me with the full and precise extract from Doctor Sullivan's letter, in which he charges me with a deep design, in conjunction with Mr. Sheehy, to force him to resign his professorship."

We are to inform you in reply that the Commissioners do not feel themselves justified in acceding to your request.

We are further to inform you that the passage in Dr. Sullivan's letter to which you refer, was not taken into consideration by the Committee, and that the Commissioners were not influenced by it, in the slightest degree, in coming to a decision in your case.

We are, &c.

(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.
&c. &c.

No. 1. (N.)

CORRESPONDENCE between the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, and Mr. *James W. Kavanagh* (late Head Inspector of National Schools), relative to the Order of the Board depressing him from the rank of Head Inspector to that of District Inspector, and also to his Conduct subsequent to that Order; from the 28th November 1857, to the 13th February 1858.

(Minute.—Inspection Department, B. O. 27/11/57.)

Office of National Education,

Sir, 28 November 1857.

WE are directed by the Commissioners of National Education to forward to you the accompanying copy of an order passed unanimously at the meeting of the Board on yesterday.

We are, &c.

(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

James W. Kavanagh, Esq.
Head Inspector.

MINUTE of the Commissioners of National Education, with reference to *James W. Kavanagh*, Esq., one of the Head Inspectors of National Schools. Dated 27 November 1857.

Ordered, That Mr. Kavanagh be informed that the Commissioners have had under consideration the report of the Committee appointed on the 11th of September last, to inquire into several matters of misconduct alleged against him, and that they do not consider it necessary to instruct the Committee to extend their investigation into any other cases that were referred to them.

The

The Commissioners deem it sufficient to confine themselves to those in the report which they consider most serious; viz.,

1. Mr. Kavanagh's advertisement announcing the fifth edition of his arithmetic.

2. Mr. Kavanagh's correspondence and conduct relative to the depression in classification, by order of the Board, of Mr. Thomas J. Little, Master of Keash National School, county Sligo.

3. A statement drawn up in the Inspection Department, showing numerous irregularities and protracted delays in the transmission of his journals and other documents; his unjustifiable neglect in not answering official letters for a long time after they were received; and his blameable conduct in not taking steps, in proper time, to make the necessary arrangements for introducing the system of organisation into the National Schools of the Dublin district, which were delayed from the 19th of January to the commencement of March.

4. Mr. Kavanagh's charges against some officers of the Board, of writing articles in the Dublin newspapers, hostile to the national system, or of supplying them with materials for their attacks; and his correspondence relating to those charges, particularly his letter of the 5th November, in which he attempts to justify them.

Mr. Kavanagh is to be further informed, that the Commissioners having fully considered the unanimous decision of the Committee on the four points above enumerated (independently of any others), and having had before them a record of several of their minutes, in which he was severely censured, and threatened with dismissal from their service for repeated acts of indiscretion, and for the disrespectful and insubordinate tone of his correspondence, are unanimously of opinion that his conduct has been of such a character as to deserve severe punishment; and the Commissioners accordingly direct,

That Mr. Kavanagh be depressed from the rank of Head Inspector to that of District Inspector of the first class, at the minimum salary of 320*l.* per annum, from the 1st of January 1858, when a district will be assigned to him.

Mr. Kavanagh is meanwhile to continue to discharge the duties of his present situation.

By order of the Board.

(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

Office of National Education,
28 November 1857.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 15 December 1857.

I BEG leave to acknowledge, with feelings of pain beyond my power of expression, the order of the Commissioners of the 27th ultimo, conveyed in your letter of the following day, intimating their decision upon the report made by the Committee appointed on the 11th September last, to consider various matters in reference to me.

This decision, deeply as it affects my public character and my private interests, cannot be confined in its results to me personally, but must influence the feelings, the conduct, and the hopes of every thoughtful officer in the service; and I trust to the indulgence of the Commissioners while I lay before them, humbly and with the utmost brevity, some of the grounds upon which I request a reconsideration of that decision.

The Order of the Board informs me, that the Committee had several matters in reference to me under consideration, and further, that there were others of a like nature into which the Commissioners did not consider it necessary for the Committee to enter. The four following are selected as the most serious amongst the matters considered by the Committee:—

1st. The handbill advertisement, announcing the publication of the fifth edition of my arithmetic.

In reference to this, no matter what view the Commissioners may take of the language used in the handbill, a copy of which I attach, it is undeniable that it has not been circulated, save fifty copies; and practically, therefore, it has been almost as inoperative as if it never existed. No inspector had been asked to sell or to promote the sale of the work, whereas the Circular of 17th September last, addressed to the whole staff of inspectors, is in itself a punishment, both as to

to character and pecuniary interest, far exceeding, as I humbly conceive, any error of judgment committed in printing and intending to circulate the handbill.

The most unfounded statements have been spread through some of the highest quarters in the city respecting the nature of this advertisement, such as that it contained corrupt offers to promote teachers who would purchase the book, and, in self-defence I have had to place some of the bills at the disposal of my friends, in order to remove from the minds of such parties this gross misrepresentation. I beg leave to again call attention to my letters of October 6th and 12th, in which I establish, beyond the power of contradiction, that Dr. Sullivan, Professor M'Gauley, Mr. Lawler, the proprietor of the Schoolmaster's Magazine, and others, had for years employed, with the full cognizance of the official authorities, their position to promote and the staff of inspectors to sell their works. The letters and circulars are before you, proving this; and how then could I imagine that the step which I was about to take, but had not taken, would give offence to the Board? At this moment Dr. Sullivan sells at his nephew's a work, "Papers on Popular Education for Managers and Teachers," * which he recommends to the teachers during his lectures to them while in training, and which he solicited me and other inspectors, by printed circular, to contribute to, to support and promote. Unlike my arithmetic, this work for managers and teachers is openly hostile to numerous and important practices, approved of by the Commissioners, and its chief matter is a compilation or extracts from his "Lectures on Popular Education," to bring out which the Board advanced 1,000 *l.* (*see* his own letter to this effect); but objectionable matter having been noticed in the work by the late Archbishop Murray, it was soon withdrawn from the Board's list. Several of the members of the Board warmly approve of my book; the highest personage in this island feels a kindly interest in its success; the resident Commissioner was warm and urgent in the desire for the publication of the present edition of it; and my colleagues, who I may be permitted to say, could not be surpassed as judges upon such a question, have expressed their opinion that in it "I have dealt with commercial arithmetic in its largest sense, such as no other man who has published an arithmetic, and on this ground alone it deserves public support;" * * and (Dr. Newell adds) "I am happy as a friend and proud that the Commissioners have in their service a man who has produced a treatise on arithmetic that is at present without a rival in the English tongue." The opinions of Mr. Keenan, Dr. Patten, and Mr. Sheahan are of a similar character, and the ablest of the inspectors and other officers of the Board have again and again given equally strong testimony.

Under all these circumstances, I beg leave most respectfully to submit that the printing of this handbill is not a grave offence, and the open manner in which it was done shows clearly that, at all events, I was perfectly unconscious that it would incur any blame whatever from the Commissioners.

2d. Correspondence and conduct relative to the classification of Mr. Little, teacher of Keash National School, county Sligo.

In reference to this case, I beg leave to declare my utter ignorance of the precise charge involved in it against me. Rev. Mr. Congrave, parish priest, manager of that school, wrote to me in 1856, informing me that the teacher was depressed two grades, with a loss of salary from 32 *l.* to 24 *l.* a year, upon the unfavourable report of the district inspector, the teacher never before, in his six years' service, having received reproof or admonition of any kind; and requesting me, as head inspector, and known as the teacher was to me, to consider the matter. I read the reports upon the school, spoke over the matter with the inspector, whose subsequent report was rather favourable, and with the full concurrence of the latter summoned Little to the examination of teachers in the district, and the inspector and I cordially agreed in recommending the Board to restore the man to his former rank. This I should do in all similar cases, unless I am directed, which I have never been, to the contrary. Reference to the official records will show that it is a case of frequent occurrence with all the head inspectors. As to the question of when the remarks were made by me in reference to this case upon the classification sheet, and the object which was attributed to me in so making them, I have fully replied to these in my letter

* Published last year.

letter of July 1st upon the subject. From neither the inspector's nor secretaries' letters was I made aware of the chief point which appears to have been raised in this case, and on learning it from a member of the Board, for the first time, I left him under the impression that I had fully cleared up the doubtful matter. Five minutes' explanation to the Commissioners, with a sheaf of classification sheets from the office, would settle the matter.

3d. Statement of delays in the transmission of journals, letters, and documents and neglect as to the arrangements respecting the organisation of the Dublin schools last spring.

I beg leave to call the special and most serious attention of the Commissioners to this head, as it is upon this, in a great measure, that the committee was appointed.

In the 13 years that I have been district and head inspector, I have no recollection of having received, up to July last, more than one Board's order, complaining of delay in the transmission of my journals, or other documents; that one was in the winter of 1854. At the end of June a near and dear relative of mine died in Tullamore. My mind and feelings were naturally withdrawn from my duties, especially those of a routine nature; and the first three weeks in July, 4th, 11th, and 18th, I sent in no weekly journals, but I was in correspondence with the office, and my address was known. The arrear of these three journals caused an order of the Board to be sent to me calling for an explanation, and also as to four unanswered letters, and to the fact, that in the 10 months previous 11 letters had been written to me, calling on me to forward my journals. Two of the four letters were wholly unimportant, so far as urgency was concerned; a third I had been in correspondence about, and the fourth needed no reply, as its object had ceased. I submitted an explanation of the delay, and to which I received no reply; but I learned from an official return in the secretaries' office, that my explanation was not only deemed unsatisfactory, but, in addition, a new and most serious charge was prepared against me. I was in this return accused for the first time of the grossest neglect, in relation to the arrangements for organising the Dublin schools some seven or eight months previous. It was stated, that on the return of the organisers from Belfast they were nearly a fortnight idle in Dublin, no work being ready for them. This is wholly inaccurate; several schools were ready for them on their arrival in Dublin on Monday, 2d March; but for reasons stated in my letters (October 5th and 31st), we deemed it better to otherwise engage them up to Saturday 7th, when they, with 66 of the Dublin teachers, had explained to them their future proceedings; and their schools were allotted to them, and on Monday 9th they were all at work. It was also stated in that return, that some of the organisers had been excluded from schools because I had failed to explain the scheme to the managers. This is without any foundation whatever. Finally, it was stated that I had, owing to my neglect, well-nigh shipwrecked the entire scheme of organisation in Dublin, the very reverse being the fact, that mainly to me its entire success was due. Further to show the loose and inaccurate statements upon this matter, I beg to refer to two official documents. In the Board's order of the 27th ult., under Head 3, it is stated, "His (Mr. Kavanagh's) blameable conduct is not taking steps in proper time to make the necessary arrangements for introducing the system of organisation into the national schools of the Dublin district, which were delayed from the 19th January to the commencement of March." Doubtless this statement was laid before the Committee and before the Board, and upon this unfounded charge my character is injured. 19th January I got instructions that the organisers were in Belfast; that they were likely to remain there for upwards of a month; that on their return to Dublin they were to undertake the organisation of the city schools, and that I was to select, with the approbation of the managers, the schools in Dublin to be organised by them, and supply a list of same. The organisers arrived in Dublin on Saturday, 28th February, and only on Monday, 2d March, could they do any work, whereas the statement before the Committee was that I delayed the arrangements from 19th January to the commencement of March; as if the arrangements were needed at the former date, but were culpably delayed till the latter. The second case is a letter from the Secretaries to Mr. Keenan, head inspector, dated 16th March last, in reference to a suggestion made by him in a communication of 25th February, and in

which they inform him that it was not possible to act on his suggestion, as I had failed to make arrangements to have the Dublin schools organised, although instructed to do so by their letter of 19th January. I am wholly unable to account for this most extraordinary statement, as on the very day that that letter (16/3/57) was written, not only were the arrangements made and completed, and the organisers in full work for the whole of the previous week, to the knowledge of all my official superiors, but before it could have been despatched to Mr. Keenan, he and I waited on the Resident Commissioner to inform him of the tour through the schools under organisation that day made by his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, attended by us, on both sides of the city.

I pray that the Commissioners may be pleased to ascertain the precise facts under this head; I am not aware, nor would I be informed, of the exact charge preferred, but I have fully proved that portions of it, and most important portions, are most inaccurate.

4th. The charge made by me, that officers in the Board's service have written or supplied materials for articles in the portion of the public press hostile to the national system.

I have given two instances wherein the fact that some officers have so afforded the information cannot be contradicted, and the other cases admit of circumstantial evidence only. Not only am I convinced of the truth of the allegation as to the articles in the "Daily Express," but several parties, some above me in station, have made similar statements.

Having now noticed the four points, I beg leave to observe that the Report of the Committee thereon has not been intimated to me, nor am I informed whether my explanations in reference to the several matters were read and considered by them.

It is also stated that the Commissioners had before them "a record of several of their minutes, in which I was severely censured and threatened with dismissal from their service, for repeated acts of indiscretion, and for the disrespectful and insubordinate tone of my correspondence," and as to dismissal I regret to have to state that such threat was twice made. Once, when the threat was made in reference to all the five head inspectors, and once in reference to an altercation with the Galway Board of Guardians. On reference to the Minute of January 1854, respecting the latter, it will be found that "the lamentable indiscretion" therein, was the letter I wrote to Rev. Mr. Kelleher, Dunmanway, respecting the Scripture Lessons, and my evidence before the Lords' Committee, shortly after, proves the injustice done to me in that matter.

Reviewing the whole of the recent proceedings, I am distressed in mind to a degree, perilous not merely to my health, which is already visibly shattered, but even to my life, that the Commissioners should view my conduct and actions in so unfavourable a light; my bitterest enemies must admit that most of the instances in which I have incurred the displeasure of the Board, arose from zeal and devotion to the cause of national education, directed by a temperament naturally warm, and perhaps precipitate. The aspirations of my boyhood, the struggles of my youth, and the earnestness of my manhood were requited, when the Commissioners, 11 years ago, placed me in my present situation. In many an arena I have since defended the national system, and although the Commissioners fully admit the important services which I have rendered to it, they are few and small, compared with what I wished, or what I attempted under it, and in a great measure through it I have enjoyed a large meed of honour and distinction. I beg leave to earnestly tender to the Commissioners the expression of my sincere and deep regret that I have unconsciously displeased them. If I am permitted to retain my present position, I hope to be able to prove to them, by my conduct, that the matters now unsatisfactory to them will be corrected or avoided. I ask this trial on the grounds of my long and faithful services, and under the conviction, that if granted, I shall be able to remove from their minds the memory of the past, and to put my character in a favourable light before them.

I have, &c.

(signed) *James W. Kavanagh,*

Head Inspector.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

MR. KAVANAGH'S ADVERTISEMENT, announcing the Fifth Edition of his Arithmetic, referred to in the foregoing Letter.

Just Published, price 2*s.*; free by post, 2*s.* 4*d.*

ARITHMETIC, its PRINCIPLES and PRACTICE, by *James W. Kavanagh*, Esq., Head Inspector of National Schools.

THIS edition (5th) is considerably enlarged, by new and important matter upon Coins and Coinage, Decimal Coinage, Notation, Decimals, and Interest.

The work is interspersed with ample directions as to the best mode of teaching the subject, and organising classes in it. In this respect it is the only work of the kind which embodies both the entire science of Arithmetic, and also the method of treating it as approved by all the Head Inspectors, and as practised in the Central Training and Model School Departments. Teachers, Pupil-Teachers, and Monitors, who master its matter, cannot fail in any personal examination on Arithmetic, to which they may be subjected; and if they adhere to its form and method, they may feel confident, that in this most important branch their Classes will be efficiently taught, and favourably reported on by the Inspectors.

Published by MARCUS and JOHN SULLIVAN, 27, Marlborough-street, Dublin; or may be had through the Author (Education Office), or through most of the District Inspectors.

N. B.—Post-office orders, the best form of remittance.

(B. O. 18/12/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 19 December 1857.

THE Commissioners of National Education have had before them your letter of the 15th instant, stating some of the grounds on which you request a reconsideration of their decision of the 27th ultimo, and asking to be permitted to retain your present position (head inspector) on trial.

We are directed to inform you, in reply, that the Commissioners decline to comply with your request.

With reference to the observation in your letter, viz., "Nor am I informed whether my explanations, in reference to the several matters, were read and considered by them," we are further to state that all your explanations and letters were laid before and fully considered by the Committee appointed to inquire into your case.

We are, &c.

To J. W. Kavanagh, Esq. &c. &c. &c. (signed) *M. Cross*, *J. Kelly*, } Secretaries.

Education Office, Training Department,

Gentlemen, 18 December 1857.

I HAVE heard that Mr. Kavanagh in a letter addressed to you yesterday, has stated that the Board had advanced 1,000*l.* to enable me to bring out my lectures and letters on popular education, and that he also quotes a letter from me in proof of his assertion. Now, if you refer to the minutes of the Board, and the other official documents which were recently quoted by me for the information of the committee, you will find that this is a gross misstatement, and what makes it worse is, that Mr. Kavanagh seems to be, and, in fact, professes himself to be well acquainted with all these documents. I need not say that the letter of mine which he bids you to see in confirmation of his statement does not, nor never did exist. After the book in question had been brought out at my own expense, the Board bought from me 2,000 copies at a shilling each, which they sold to their schools at a penny profit, so that they lost nothing by the transaction. The sum which the Board paid me on receipt of the books was 100*l.* This Mr. Kavanagh has converted into 1,000*l.*, not, I am sure, designedly, but from recklessness of assertion. In a recent letter from him to you on the subject of the same book, he stated that the number of copies purchased from me by the Board was 20,000. This error was pointed out by me in my letter of explanation to the committee, and it appears in another form for 20,000 shillings, 1,000*l.*

I have explained before that there is nothing in the papers on popular education to show that they were published or edited by an officer of the Board;

and that it is expressly stated in the preface that it was an independent publication, and that the editors were alone responsible for any views or opinions which they might contain. I have also shown that this publication was brought out for the special benefit of the teachers, and with the certainty of a considerable pecuniary sacrifice on the part of the publisher.

I am, &c.
(signed) *Robert Sullivan.*

To the Secretaries.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 23 December 1857.

In my letter of the 15th instant, I stated that the Commissioners in 1842 advanced 1,000*l.* to Professor Sullivan to bring out a work, "Lectures on Popular Education;" that this work was placed on the price list; that he sent urgent circulars to the Inspectors to forward the sale of this, as well as his other works; that objection was made to a portion of the matter in the lectures by the late Archbishop Murray, upon which the work was withdrawn from the Board's list, over ten years' since; that in September 1854, Dr. Sullivan by a printed circular marked "Private and confidential," announced to me and several of the inspectors, that he was about to publish a serial called "Papers on Popular Education for Managers and Teachers," requesting our support of the work, and inviting our contributions to it; that the three numbers of this serial published in spring 1856, contain articles openly hostile to practices approved of by the Commissioners, and that the serial consists in a great measure of extracts from "Lectures on Popular Education," that he recommends in his addresses of instruction to the teachers in training, this work to them, and that considering these and other matters stated in my recent communications to the Board, the manner in which I have been treated by the Commissioners in reference to the printing of the handbill, announcing the publication of my arithmetic is anomalous, and to me incomprehensible.

Dr. Sullivan may have had this letter of mine referred to him by the Board; but in the case of communications from me that would appear to be unnecessary, as he and others have in several instances written and commented upon official letters of mine which did not come before them regularly, and his comments thereon he read to Messrs. Rintoul, D. O. Sullivan, Larkin, and Dr. Clarke, before sending them to the Commissioners. The "peace and good will to men," recalled to our minds at this season, has not influenced Dr. Sullivan in relation to me, as last month he declared his conviction that I was a "conspirator," and now he accuses me of being "reckless," and habitually so, in my statements. As to the former I respectfully sought inquiry and protection from the Board, in the first instance, and I now beg to apply for the same in this case.

Dr. Sullivan states, that the 1,000*l.* stated by me as having been advanced to him by the Board in 1842, was only 100*l.*, and even were it so it would leave the principle in the matter perfectly unaltered. Professor Sullivan writing in April 1842 of a transaction which had just taken place, ought to be a better authority as to a correct statement of it than Dr. Sullivan writing of it in December 1857. I enclose, on the express condition of its being returned to me, as it is not my property, Professor Sullivan's own letter to the inspectors, stating as to the lectures, "The agreement between the Board and me is, that they take 20,000 copies of the work, on condition that I am to refund the money unless they are sold within six months. The price paid, or rather advanced by the Board, is 1*s.* a copy in sheets; and the binding will [*be* omitted] 3*d.*" If it be "reckless" of me to accept Professor Sullivan's written testimony in reference to a simple matter of fact, I then fully deserve the epithet at his hands, as when he wrote that the Board advanced 20,000 shillings to help him to publish a book, I wrote the sum 1,000*l.*

I understand that he also contradicts some other statements made in my letter of the 15th instant, in reference to the book question, such as that some document to which I refer never had existence, and as I am not in possession of the precise points which he contradicts, I can only reiterate the accuracy of every statement made in my letter, and my readiness to prove this beyond the shadow of a doubt.

In

In requesting that this matter may be laid before the Commissioners at their next meeting, I beg leave to remind them that the mention of Dr. Sullivan's name in reference to the book question was not gratuitous, unkind, or unfriendly on my part, but wholly and exclusively as a matter of self-defence, forced upon me by the peculiar view which the Board took of what I had done in printing the handbill about my arithmetic.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh*,
Head Inspector National Schools.

The Secretaries, Education Office,
Marlborough-street.

My dear Sir, Education Office, 14 April 1842.

I HAVE at length been enabled to send you (through Mr. Lawrence) a copy of my lectures.

Should you consider it as a work likely to be useful to our schools, you will greatly oblige me by doing what you can to assist me in getting it off as soon as possible. Lest you should suppose that I have turned book-maker, and wish to turn my friends into booksellers, I shall state briefly the circumstances connected with each of my publications, and leave you to judge.

First, the Outline.—The necessity for something of the kind led me to draw up, and print this little work at my own expense. For the use that is made of it by the Board, I receive nothing; nor do I expect to make as much by the public sale of it, as will pay my expenses out of pocket, for few persons will give money to the booksellers for a work which they can have for nothing from the Board.

Second, the Geography.—After waiting three years for a geography which Mr. Carlisle had engaged to compile, I wrote mine to supply the urgent demand for a work of this kind till his should appear. The Board, as you are aware, are at no loss by this work, nor am I gainer. In fact I will be a loser by the present edition; should the work succeed it will pay.

The Lecture.—The necessity of something of the kind, particularly for the untrained teachers, led me to publish this work at my own risk and expense. The agreement between the Board and me, is this; they take 20,000 copies of the work on condition that I am to refund the money unless they are sold within six months. The price paid, or rather advanced by the Board, is 1 *s.* a copy in sheet, and the binding will 3 *d.* *Sic.*

The only books for which I require your friendly are the geography and the lectures, and only for the present edition. Should any of the teachers inquire about the other book, you will oblige me by informing them that they must get some person to call on Mr. Lawrence, our bookseller, for them. *Sic.*

I am, &c.
(signed) *Robert Sullivan.*

(B. O. 24/12/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 29 December 1857.

THE Commissioners of National Education have had before them your letter of the 23d instant, in reference to a statement made by you in your letter of the 15th, that in the year 1842, they advanced a sum of 1,000 *l.* to Doctor Sullivan to bring out a work entitled "Lectures on Popular Education," also the letter enclosed by you in proof of your statement addressed by Doctor Sullivan, to one of the superintendents of national schools, dated 14th April 1842, in which it is mentioned that the Board had agreed to take 20,000 copies at 1 *s.* per copy, making the sum in question.

We are directed to inform you in reply that the Commissioners decline to reopen the case to which your letter relates, and that they also decline for the present to return, as requested by you, the letter of Doctor Sullivan of the 14th April 1842.

We are further directed to state that the Commissioners have given directions to us to return to you all letters which may be received from you, relating to

any of the various matters reported upon by the committee appointed to inquire into your conduct, and which have been maturely considered, and upon which they have come to a final decision.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

(B. O. 24/12/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 29 December 1857.

Referring to the minute of the Board of the 27th November last, directing that from the 1st January 1858, you be depressed to the rank of District Inspector, we are to inform you that the Commissioners of National Education have ordered that district 50, vacant by the promotion of Mr. Sheridan to the office of Head Inspector, be assigned to you; that you be requested to make arrangements for proceeding to Cork, the centre of the district, with as little delay as possible, and that you be also requested to state on or before Thursday next, when the Board are again to meet, how soon you will be prepared to enter upon your duties in the district assigned you.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.
&c. &c.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 31 December 1857.

In reply to the request made in your letter of the 29th instant, I beg leave to inform the Commissioners that I am anxious to complete for publication the following General Reports:

1. On Schools inspected in 1856–57.
2. On the State of Education in the Metropolitan and Suburban Schools.
3. On the Working of the Trim and the Bailieborough D. M. Schools.
4. On the Examination of Teachers and paid Monitors.
5. Special Reports on Prison and Reformatory Schools; those in Mountjoy, Grangegorman, Newgate, Smithfield, and Philipstown, visited this year.

The usual time allowed for the completion of the ordinary annual reports of the Head Inspectors is six weeks, but they generally occupy a longer period. Since the Board's Order of the 27th ultimo was communicated to me, although I have been as fully engaged as I could, official duties which I wished to close before the end of the year chiefly engaged my attention; and the preparation of the above reports would afford ample occupation until about the middle of February, as I have yet many matters to arrange, both with the office and the inspectors, in relation to my past duties.

I may also add, that at present my health is not such as would permit me to enter upon the duty assigned to me, nor could I remove at this season, and at such short notice, my large family from Dublin; and my own health absolutely requires the care of my home.

Should the Board decline to permit the preparation of the above reports, I have then to request that I may be marked on leave of absence for the month of January, and which is the less a favour when it is known that, entitled to 66 weeks' vacation in the past 11 years, the amount taken cannot have amounted to more than 10 or 12 weeks, if at all so much.

I remain, &c.
The Secretaries, Education Office. (signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

(B. O. 31/12/57.)

Sir, Education Office, 2 January 1858.

We have laid before the Commissioners of National Education your letter of the 31st ultimo, requesting permission to complete for publication the reports therein enumerated; or if it be not granted, that you should have leave of absence during the current month.

Understanding

Understanding from your letter that you accept the situation of district Inspector, to which you were appointed from 1st January 1858, by Board's Order of the 27th of last November, and that you will be prepared, on the 1st February, to enter on the active discharge of its duties in the district assigned to you, the Commissioners have granted you the leave of absence for which you have applied, the more particularly as they observe from your statements that, at present, your health is not such as to permit you to enter upon the duty assigned to you, and that you could not remove your large family from Dublin at this season of the year, and on such short notice.

We have also to add that as the state of your health seems to demand a temporary cessation from official business, the Commissioners will not require you to furnish the reports in question.

You are now requested to forward to this office as soon as possible any official books, papers, or documents connected with your late appointment, or such of them at least as, not being necessary for yourself personally, may be required for the use of your successor.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

James W. Kavanagh, Esq.,
Inspector of National Schools, Rathgar.

(B. O. 22/1/58.)

Sir, Education Office, 23 January 1858.

The Commissioners have had under consideration the report of Mr. Coyle, district inspector, on the organisation of the Linen Hall-street National School, dated 28th ultimo, to which they find you have appended the following remarks:

"Mr. Cribbin's observations show clearly the extreme diffidence, if not suspicion, with which many of the Roman Catholic clergy viewed the scheme of organisation, even after they had, on Mr. Coyle's and my representation, agreed to give it trial; and they further prove the injustice done to me by the Board in reference to the organisation. Never upon any single question has greater injustice been done to a public servant than the Board has done, or permitted to be done to me in reference to this, as must yet be admitted."

The Commissioners regard these remarks as in the highest degree insubordinate and offensive, and they require you to sign in our presence a memorandum on the report to the effect that you withdraw and cancel those very objectionable remarks.

For this purpose we are to direct that you will present yourself at this office on Wednesday next, the 27th instant, at 12 o'clock precisely. In the meanwhile you are to state in writing whether or not you are prepared to comply with this order, confining your answer to a simple affirmative or negative, without comment or explanation.

In the event of your refusing to conform to this order, the Commissioners have resolved to dismiss you from their service at their next meeting.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross*, } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 25 January 1858.

In compliance with the order of the Board (22/1/58) requiring me "to withdraw and cancel" the remarks made by me in Mr. Coyle's report upon the organisation of the Linen Hall-street National School, a portion of which are deemed objectionable, I beg leave to state that I shall do so, and with a view to this I shall call at the office on to-morrow, in order to cancel the passage as rquired, as a previous engagement prevents me from calling on Wednesday at

the time named; should I fail to obtain the means of cancelling the part objected to on to-morrow, I shall call to the office on Thursday, at 12 o'clock, for that purpose.

I am, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries, Education Office.

P. S.—The terms of the Board's instructions prohibit me from making comment or explanation in reference to the above.

J. W. K.

Extract from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board, dated 29 January 1858.

The secretary reports that in pursuance of minute of the Board of the 22d January, Mr. Kavanagh has signed a memorandum to the effect that he withdraws and cancels the objectionable remarks appended by him to the inspector's report on the organisation of the Linen Hall-street National School.

Gentlemen, Grenville, Rathgar, 1 February 1858.

I regret to have to inform the Commissioners that my health is such as to preclude me from entering upon any duty for some time; although the low and weakly state of my health is evident, I deemed it proper to forward to you the enclosed certificate from my medical attendant, Dr. O'Connor. Should my strength and capability of duty return, I shall inform you.

I am, &c.
The Secretaries. (signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

68, Rathmines, 30 January 1858.

I certify that I have been medical attendant in Mr. Kavanagh's family for the past three years, and that I am intimately acquainted with his health, habits, and constitution. He is at present, in my opinion, unable to enter on any duties, and for the past few months I have observed a marked and serious decline in his strength, brought on, I have no doubt, by acute mental occupation and much anxiety of mind.

He requires repose of mind and much attention to his food and habits of living, and a total absence of mental or bodily activity for several weeks, in order to improve his general health. From his present low state any neglect of himself, or any work of mind or body, might prove most serious to him, and I have strictly enjoined him to attend to these instructions.

(signed) *W. H. O'Connor*, M.D. & S.

(B. O. 5/2/58.)

Sir, Education Office, 6 February 1858.

The attention of the Commissioners of National Education has been directed to your weekly journal as Head Inspector, stating the occupation of your time from Monday the 28th to Thursday the 31st December 1857, both days included, which journal was handed into this office by you on Saturday the 30th ultimo, and contains the following observation:—

"In reference to the order of the Board depriving me of the office of head inspector from 31st December, I beg to state, that I shall elsewhere set forth the grounds upon which I believe that such decision should not be arrived at."

With reference to the foregoing observation, we are directed to inform you, that from the present date you are suspended from the performance of all duty as

as District Inspector of National Schools, and that your salary ceases from the date of your suspension.

We are also to acquaint you that your conduct in handing in the journal containing the observation above quoted, will be made the subject of consideration at a special meeting of the Board, to be held on Friday the 12th instant.

The Commissioners further direct that you will transmit to us any explanation you may desire to offer respecting this matter, not later than three o'clock on Tuesday next, the 9th instant, as the preparation of the "programme of business" to be issued to the Commissioners cannot be delayed beyond that time.

We are, &c.
(gned) *Maurice Cross*, *James Kelly*, Secretaries.

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

Gentlemen, Education Office, 9 February 1858.

In compliance with the directions of the Commissioners, as contained in your letter of the 6th instant, I beg leave to state, that I had written my journal for the last three days in December, at the close of that month, and entered thereon 13 numbered grounds upon which I dissented from the order of the Board depriving me of my office, and this journal I now showed to Mr. Cross. The decision in the case of the remarks made by me in the report upon Linen Hall-street National School, pointed out to me that I could not send in that journal, I therefore drew up, on Saturday, 30th January, the one sent in; and, naturally anxious to leave some record that I did not concur in the decision of the Board which, after 11 years, deprived me of my situation, I entered, as the mildest and least objectionable that I could frame, the remarks quoted. By "elsewhere" I simply meant, by special letter; not on a mere financial sheet, like a journal, and when the proper time would come, to submit such to the Board.

I am, &c.
(signed) *Jas. W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries,
Education Office.

Grenville, Rathgar,
6 February, 8 o'clock, P.M., 1858.

Gentlemen,

I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt, by special messenger, of your letter of this date, communicating the order made by the Commissioners at their meeting of yesterday, and I lose not a moment in replying thereto.

I am informed that the Commissioners had before them my journal, as Head Inspector, for the last three days in December 1857, which contains the following observation:—"In reference to the order of the Board, depriving me of the office of Head Inspector, from 31st December, I beg leave to state that I shall elsewhere set forth the grounds upon which I believe that such decision should not be arrived at." You then state, "With reference to the foregoing observation, we are directed to inform you, that from the present date you are suspended from the performance of all duty* as District Inspector of National Schools, and that your salary ceases from the date of your suspension."

You then inform me that my conduct in handing in this journal, meaning, I presume, in having inserted therein the observation quoted, will be made the subject of consideration by the Board at a special meeting to be held on Friday, the 12th instant; and you further inform me that the Commissioners direct that I shall transmit to you any explanation I may desire to offer respecting this matter, not later than three o'clock on Tuesday, 9th instant.

I beg leave to state, in reply, that I had written my journal for these three days at the end of December, and entered thereon 13 numbered grounds upon which I dissented from the order of the Board, depriving me of my office; and that

* I never did any such duty, having been on leave of absence since 1st January.—*J. W. K.*

that this journal is in my possession. The order of the Board, made in reference to the remarks made by me in Mr. Coyle's report upon the Linen Hall-street National School, showed me that the Board would be displeased should I send in that journal, I therefore filed the copy* which is referred to; and naturally anxious to leave some record that I did not concur in the decision of the Board, which, after 11 years deprived me of my situation, I entered, as the mildest and least objectionable that I could frame, the remarks quoted. By "elsewhere" I simply meant by letter, not on a mere financial sheet like a journal; and when the proper time would come, to submit such to the Board. I submit this explanation as a duty to myself.

Reviewing the proceedings of the past few months in reference to me, I feel that self-respect and honour alike compel me to adopt the course which the Board's order of November dictates; and with deep regret I, from this date, tender my resignation, and beg leave, after 24 years' devoted labours in the cause of the national system, to withdraw from the service of the Commissioners.

I have to request that the Commissioners will proceed with the decision of the five cases in which I am concerned, and referred to in my letter of the 16th ultimo, as if I were still in their service, and that the results may be communicated to me.

I have also to request that you will return the letter of Professor Sullivan, addressed to one of the superintendents in 1842, as it is not my property.

Should you need to address me on any subject, my address will be as above.

I have, &c.
(signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

The Secretaries, Education Office,
Marlbro' Street.

P.S.—I wrote this letter at the above date, but I sent in the explanatory paragraph, page 2, on Tuesday last, in a separate letter, at the wish of Mr. Cross.

11 February 1858. (signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

(B. O. 12/2/58.)

Sir, Education Office, 13 February 1858.

Having laid before the Commissioners of National Education, your letter of the sixth instant, in which you state "I from this date tender my resignation, and beg leave to withdraw from the service of the Commissioners," we are directed to inform you that the Commissioners accept your resignation.

The salary of your office of District Inspector of National Schools will be paid up to the date of your resignation of it, viz., 6th February 1858.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

(B. O. 12/2/58.)

Sir, Education Office, 13 February 1858.

In compliance with the request contained in your letter of the 6th instant, we are directed to return the communication of the 14th April 1842, addressed by Professor Sullivan to one of the Superintendents of National Schools.

We are, &c.
(signed) *Maurice Cross,* } Secretaries.
James Kelly, }

J. W. Kavanagh, Esq.

---

* On the 30th January, at the request of Mr. Claridge, and with a view to close some accounts with him. Into his office I handed the journal.

— No. 2. —

RETURN of the Names of the MEMBERS appointed on the SPECIAL COMMITTEE of the 11th day of September last, in reference to Mr. *Kavanagh*, with the Names of those subsequently added; the precise Matters which the Committee was first appointed to investigate, and a Statement of any others afterwards added; the Dates of the several Sittings of the Committee, with the Members present at each.

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board of the 11th September 1858, appointing a Committee to inquire into the conduct of Mr. *Kavanagh*, &c.

Ordered, That the various papers relating to matters in which Mr. Kavanagh is concerned, together with the documents laid before the Board this day, be referred to a Committee for consideration, and with instructions to prepare a report thereon, to be submitted to the Commissioners at a special meeting.

Ordered, that the Committee consist of the following members:—

Rev. Dr. Henry.	James O'Ferrall, esq.
Robert Andrews, esq.	Right Hon. Alex. Macdonnell.
Right Hon. J. Hatchell.	

Names of those subsequently added.

By Board's order 23d October 1857, James Gibson, esq.
By - ditto - 30th October 1857, J. S. Murphy, esq., M.C., and Very Rev. Dean Meyler.

The Dates of the several Meetings of the Committee, with the Members present at each.

First Meeting. 14th November 1857.

Very Rev. Dean Meyler.	James Gibson, esq.
Rev. Dr. Henry.	James O'Ferrall, esq.
Robert Andrews, esq.	Right Hon. Alex. Macdonnell.

Second Meeting. 16th November 1857.

Very Rev. Dean Meyler.	James O'Ferrall, esq.
Rev. Dr. Henry.	James Gibson, esq.
Robert Andrews, esq.	Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.
Right Hon. John Hatchell.	

Third Meeting. 18th November 1857.

Right Hon. J. Hatchell.	James Gibson, esq.
James O'Ferrall, esq.	Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.

Fourth Meeting. 21st November 1857.

Right Hon. J. Hatchell.	James Gibson, esq.
James O'Ferrall, esq.	Right Hon. Alex. Macdonnell.
Robert Andrews, esq.	

Fifth Meeting. 24th November 1857.

Right Hon. J. Hatchell.	James Gibson, esq.
Very Rev. Dean Meyler.	R. Andrews, esq.
James O'Ferrall, esq.	Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.

Sixth Meeting. 26th November 1857.

Right Hon. J. Hatchell.	James Gibson, esq.
James O'Ferrall, esq.	Right Hon. Alex. Macdonnell.

— No. 3. —

COPY of the Minutes of the Business transacted by the Committee appointed to Inquire into and Report upon various Matters affecting the Conduct of *J. W. Kavanagh*, Head Inspector.

First Meeting. Saturday, 14th November 1857.

Members present:

Very Rev. Dean Meyler.	James Gibson, esq.
Rev. Dr. Henry.	James O'Ferrall, esq.
Robert Andrews, esq.	Right Hon. Alex. Macdonnell.

Rev. Dr. Henry in the Chair.

The Committee deliberate upon the course they will pursue in conducting the inquiry, and direct the secretary to read the list of the cases in which Mr. Kavanagh is concerned, with a statement of the general purport of each.

The Committee decide upon taking into consideration, first, a letter from Mr. Kavanagh, dated the 13th instant, which was laid before the Board at its meeting on Friday last, and referred to the Committee by order of the Commissioners, for their decision thereon, together with a copy of their Minute characterising the tone and language of it as "most offensive and insubordinate." This letter (case 14) contains the following request: "That Mr. Kavanagh claims, if not the right, the privilege, to be present at the sittings of the Committee, in order to take notes and watch the proceedings; but not to speak or interfere, unless called upon or permitted, and only at so much of the proceedings as are purely of the nature of an investigation."

Ordered, That Mr. Kavanagh's application be refused, and that he be informed that if his personal attendance at the Committee be deemed necessary for any purpose whatsoever, he will be sent for, and that in the meantime he is to remain in town.

The secretary reads, by direction of the Committee, a letter from Mr. Kavanagh, dated the 31st October (case 13), submitting for the consideration of the Commissioners a statement in reference to the several matters regarding him, which are likely to engage their attention, and which have been referred to a special committee, appointed to inquire into and to report thereon to the Board.

The Committee next proceed to consider the advertisement written by Mr. Kavanagh, and printed by his direction, announcing the fifth edition of his "Treatise on the Principles and Practice of Arithmetic." The secretary reads the advertisement or handbill referred to; also the minute of the Board, dated the 11th September 1857, recording a vote of censure on Mr. Kavanagh for his gross indiscretion and impropriety, &c.

Reference is also made to a passage in the preface to the fifth edition of that work; and the secretary also reads the following documents: Mr. Kavanagh's letter, dated 12th September, containing an explanatory statement regarding the publication of the advertisement; the Board's minute thereon, dated the 18th September 1857; also, letters on the same subject, dated 6th and 12th October, alleging that Dr. Sullivan and other officers of the Board had adopted a similar course with regard to their school books.

The secretary calls attention to the reply of Dr. Sullivan to the charge respecting him, dated 22d September 1857, and to the minute of the Board, dated 25th September 1857, stating that Dr. Sullivan's explanation of the transactions referred to is satisfactory; also to Dr. Sullivan's letter of the 13th October, and to the minute of the Board, dated the 16th October, directing that it be referred to the Committee.

The Committee decide that Dr. Sullivan's letter, &c. of the 13th October, above referred to, shall not be read.

The secretary reads letter to Mr. Kavanagh, dated the 13th June, declining to place his "Arithmetic" on the list of books sanctioned by the Board.

Meeting of Committee adjourned to Monday, the 16th instant, at 12 o'clock.

Second

Second Meeting. Monday, 16th November 1857.

Members present:

Very Rev. Dean Meyler.
Rev. Dr. Henry.
R. Andrews, Esq., LL.D.
Right Hon. John Hatchell.
James O'Ferrall, Esq.
James Gibson, Esq.
Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.

Right Hon. J. Hatchell in the Chair.

THE secretary reads the minutes of the proceedings adopted by the Committee at their first meeting.

The Committee resume the consideration of Mr. Kavanagh's conduct relative to the advertisement of the fifth edition of his "Arithmetic," and refer to the proceedings of the Board in October 1844, when Mr. Kavanagh was charged with similar misconduct.

The Commissioners adopt unanimously the following resolution:

That Mr. Kavanagh has endeavoured to promote the sale of his "Treatise on the Principles and Practice of Arithmetic," by an advertisement, printed, and intended to be issued, by his direction, which is calculated to lead to improper inferences on the part of the monitors, pupil teachers, inspectors, and the public, not only that the work ought to be preferred to those published and sanctioned by the Board, but also that monitors, pupil teachers, and teachers would derive peculiar advantages from using it; amongst others, that their classification would be favourably reported on by the inspectors.

That when Mr. Kavanagh published that advertisement, he held the important and influential office of head inspector under the Board; that shortly before its publication he had received the Board's minute (5th June 1857), stating that his book could not be put on the list; and having, in the month of October 1844, addressed the teachers at Glasnevin in terms similarly calculated to promote the sale of the same book, he had, on the 23d of October 1844, been informed by order of the Board that in so addressing the teachers in reference to that book he had misconducted himself.

The Committee decide upon taking into consideration the address of Mr. Kavanagh before the British Association, on September the 1st, on the "Rise, Progress, and Present Prospects of Popular Education in Ireland."

The secretary reads Mr. Kavanagh's address; also the minute of the Board of the 11th September, directing the secretaries to write to the editor of "Saunders' News Letter," informing him that Mr. Kavanagh's address was written without their sanction, &c.

Minute of the 11th September 1857, above referred to.

The secretary calls the attention of the Commissioners to an extract from the "Evening Packet," of the 5th September, in which it is insinuated that the Paper read by Mr. Kavanagh before the British Association was written by direction of the Commissioners, or with their knowledge.

Ordered, That a letter be addressed by the secretaries to the editor of "Saunders' News Letter," stating that the Commissioners of National Education have learned that many persons believe that Mr. Kavanagh's paper was written with the approbation of the Commissioners, and informing the public, through the medium of his journal, that, so far from the paper in question having been written with their authority, they would, had Mr. Kavanagh previously acquainted them with his intention, at once have prohibited him from addressing the Association on the subject.

Also observing that, so long ago as 1832 a circular was issued by the Commissioners, in which it was ordered that the inspectors and other officers of the Board be informed that they are not to publish any letter or document relating to its proceedings, or to any theological or political subject; and that they are not to write any letter on the business of the Commissioners, unless to them or by their directions.

The secretary also reads a letter from Mr. Kavanagh, dated 17th September, expressing his surprise and deep pain that the Commissioners should have thought it necessary to publish the advertisement in question, and entering into a full explanation of his conduct in the matter referred to. The circular to the inspectors, in 1832, prohibiting them from writing in the newspapers on the proceedings of the Board, is also read.

The Committee consider how far Mr. Kavanagh was to blame in delivering and publishing his address; and adjourn the further consideration of this question to Wednesday the 18th instant, at one o'clock punctually; and order that three members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Third Meeting, Wednesday, 18 November 1857.

Members present:

Right Hon. J. Hatchell.	James Gibson, Esq.
James O'Ferrall, Esq.	Right Hon. Alex. Macdonnell.

The minutes of the proceedings of the last meeting are read.

The consideration of Mr. Kavanagh's address to the British Association is further postponed.

The secretary reads the correspondence of Mr. Mahony and Mr. Kavanagh, relating to the depression of T. J. Little, in 1855, master of the Keash National School, county Sligo, from the third division, first class, to the second division of the second class; and to a proposal by Mr. Kavanagh and Mr. Mahony, for his restoration.

The grounds on which Mr. Mahony recommended Mr. Little's depression are stated on the "Classification Sheet" as follows:

"Very indifferent reading; bad pronunciation, which the teacher had evidently taken no pains to correct. A general deficiency in grammar and geography; much of the latter being the result of too high classification.

"*Acquirements.*—Apart from his classification I can find no evidence of anything beyond the most ordinary capacity in the management of his school; he may be a good scholar, but he certainly is but an indifferent teacher.

"*Method.*—Not more successful than first division of third class, or even than many of second division of third class teachers. Whatever his acquirements may be, it is evident that he is wanting either in diligence, or singularly deficient in ability to communicate instruction. He seems to have formed a very low estimate of what is to be expected from him, and there can be no doubt that he has been culpably inattentive to his duties. I have hesitated until now to express this opinion, though I had reason to form it at the previous as well as the present visit.

"*State of School.*—Stationary, or at least, progress so very far short of what might reasonably be expected from a teacher so highly classed, and so well remunerated, that it cannot be said to be progressing."

Mr. Kavanagh in his observation on the classification-sheet, characterises the report as "slightly unfavourable;" that Mr. Mahony stated and felt the decision of the Board in depressing Little as severe in the extreme, and that Mr. Mahony would have appealed against it, but was deterred from it, from the fear of incurring blame at the office. Mr. Kavanagh expresses his opinion that admonition was the usual punishment in such cases

It further appears that with the view of effecting Mr. Little's restoration, Mr. Kavanagh did not adopt the proper means by visiting his school, and testing his efficiency in school-keeping, by which alone he could judge of the merits of the case.

The Committee having fully considered the facts of this case, as shown in the correspondence, agree to a resolution condemnatory of Mr. Kavanagh's conduct in the matters referred to, and the Secretary is directed to divide the Resolutions under distinct heads, and to submit them for approval to the next meeting of the Committee.

Read report, dated 10th April 1858, of Mr. Kavanagh, upon the manner in which the official books and other records are kept by the inspectors in his district,

district, particularly with regard to the case of Mr. Mahony, Mr. M'Sweeny, Mr. Fleming, Mr. H. P. Clarke, and Mr. O'Carroll. Read also the correspondence relating thereto, viz., Mr. Kavanagh's letters dated 5th June and 15th July.

The Committee come to no decision in this case.

[Adjourned to Saturday 21st instant.

Fourth Meeting. Saturday, 21 November 1857.

Members present:

Right Hon. John Hatchell.	James Gibson, Esq.
James O'Ferrall, Esq.	Right Hon. Alex. Macdonnell.
R. Andrews, Esq.	

Right Honourable John Hatchell, Chairman.

THE minutes of the proceedings of the last meeting are read.

The Committee resume the consideration of Mr. Kavanagh's address to the British Association.

The following resolution, with reference thereto, is submitted for consideration: viz.—

1. That Mr. Kavanagh acted with great indiscretion in delivering his Address before the British Association, on the "Rise, Progress, and Present Prospects of Popular Education, in Ireland," without having first consulted and obtained the sanction of the Commissioners.

2. That Mr. Kavanagh was also blameable for having introduced into that "Address" various topics calculated to provoke controversial discussion among the opponents and the friends of the National System of Education in Ireland.

This resolution is approved by the Right Hon. John Hatchell, R. Andrews, Esq., and the Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell. James O'Ferrall, Esq., dissents from it, and states his objections thereto. James Gibson, Esq., also disapproves, and states the grounds of his dissent in writing, as follows: "That although he considers that Mr. Kavanagh should have abstained from making his address at the meeting of the British Association without the express permission of the Commissioners, and that in making such has evinced a want of discretion calculated to diminish all confidence in his judgment, yet inasmuch as the Board has publicly recorded its disclaimer of having in any way authorised Mr. Kavanagh's address, or being responsible for its statements, he (Mr. Gibson) does not consider (taking into consideration all the circumstances attending the delivery of that address) that any further censure should be passed on Mr. Kavanagh, in reference to this matter."

In pursuance of the directions of the Committee, the secretary submits the following resolutions, agreed to at its previous meeting, regarding the Keash case, divided under four heads, as follows:

1. That in reference to the depression of Mr. Little, master of the Keash National School by order of the Board, Mr. Kavanagh has sought to effect his restoration to his former class by irregular and undue means, not having visited Mr. Little's school to ascertain his qualifications for conducting it, or to test his efficiency in school-keeping, by which alone Mr. Kavanagh could form a correct judgment of the merits of the case.

2. That Mr. Kavanagh has deliberately misrepresented the grounds upon which the Commissioners decided upon lowering Mr. Little in his class, their decision on the case having been founded on a very strong condemnatory report by Mr. Mahony, the district inspector, which Mr. Kavanagh designates in his remarks in the "classification sheet," as only "slightly unfavourable."

3. That in Mr. Kavanagh's explanatory letter, dated 1st July 1857, defending the course he pursued in this matter, he has used language disrespectful to the Commissioners, and unbecoming an officer in their service holding his high position.

4. That in Mr. Kavanagh's observations on the "classification sheet," referring to the order of the Board directing Mr. Little to be depressed, he has impugned their decision in terms of which they disapprove.

The secretary reads a statement drawn up in the inspection department, showing Mr. Kavanagh's irregularity in the transmission of his journals and other official documents; in some cases for a protracted period (in one case seven weeks); and also exhibiting great neglect in the answering of letters, which caused inconvenience, and prevented the officers of the inspection department from knowing how he was engaged, and what duties he was performing.

Read, letter from Mr. Kavanagh, dated 5th October 1857, commenting on the above return, a copy of which had been transmitted to him by order of the Board, dated the 24th July 1857.

Read, also, observations on the foregoing letter, written in the inspection department, pointing out the vague and unsatisfactory character of Mr. Kavanagh's reply, it being of a general nature, and not a specific explanation under each head of the charge, which he was directed to furnish. In these observations particular reference is made to Mr. Kavanagh's neglect in making arrangements, in due time, for the organisation of the schools in the Dublin district, which he was required to do by a letter from the Secretaries on the 19th of January 1857, but which instructions he delayed acting upon until the end of the following month.

Read, further, a letter from Mr. Kavanagh, dated 5th October 1857, commenting at great length on the above documents (which he had seen in the office, but which were not officially communicated to him), and defending himself against the charge of having endangered the success of the organisation scheme, by delaying to bring it into operation at the period required by the order of the Board.

The Committee, having taken into consideration all the documents relating to this case, are unanimously of opinion—

1. That the charge contained in the statement prepared in the inspection department, showing numerous irregularities in the transmission of his journals and other official documents, and of protracted delays in answering letters, has been proved, and has not been satisfactorily answered by Mr. Kavanagh, and that he has, as regards this charge, been guilty of unjustifiable neglect.

2. The Committee are also of opinion that the reasons he assigns in his letter dated 5th October, for not taking steps in proper time to make the preliminary arrangements for introducing the organisation system into a certain number of the national schools in the Dublin district, do not exonerate him from blame, during the days he was in town and occupied in the transaction of other business, not coming within the order of the Board, which required his exclusive attention; but the Committee also consider that Mr. Kavanagh's perseverance and energy and success in subsequently working the plan, and removing difficulties which might have obstructed its progress, deserve their commendation.

3. That the language used by Mr. Kavanagh in his correspondence in this charge is marked by the same objectionable and unofficial tone which they have observed with so much regret, and deprecated in other portions of his letters and official documents which have been laid before them during the present inquiry.

[Adjourned to Tuesday the 24th instant.

Fifth Meeting, Tuesday 24 November 1857.

Members present:

Right Hon. J. Hatchell.	James Gibson, Esq.
Very Rev. Dean Meyler.	R. Andrews, Esq.
James O'Ferrall, Esq.	Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.

READ Minutes of the two last Meetings, viz., Wednesday the 18th and Saturday the 21st.

The

The secretary is directed to read the following extract from Mr. Kavanagh's letter, dated September the 17th.

"I am sorry to be compelled to express my firm conviction, a conviction frequently expressed for the past three years by several other officers of the Board, that there is a connexion (through whom I am unable to prove) between the portion of the Dublin press, notoriously unfavourable to the national system and to its sincere supporters, and some persons in the Board's service. An examination of the files of some of these papers, during the inquiry of 1854, in reference to Professor M'Gawley's case more recently, and the number of "The Daily Express" for the 16th instant, can leave no doubt whatever as to the fact. Not only is this so, but as far back as the 7th instant, it was named by a kind and influential friend, and since by others, that both officially and through the press, this combined and simultaneous attack would be made upon me, because of the success that had attended my paper, and the attention which had been shown to me in the British Association and elsewhere."

Read Board's order, dated 25th September, directing Mr. Kavanagh to state if he has any proof whatever to produce in support of the very serious charge preferred therein against some of the officers of the establishment.

Nine days having elapsed without any answer having been received to the secretaries' letter of the 26th September, a letter was written to Mr. Kavanagh the 5th October, requesting him to transmit his reply, not later than the 8th.

Read letter from Mr. Kavanagh, dated 6th October, explaining the cause of delay, and stating that he might probably be able to send up his statement by the 15th, which, not having reached the office on the 20th, another letter was sent to him on that day pressing for its transmission before the 22d.

On the 21st a reply was received from Mr. Kavanagh assigning further reasons for delay, and stating he could not name any precise day when his statement would be ready, which the secretary reads; also, his letter in support of the charge, dated the 5th November, thus making a delay of 40 days from the date of the first order of the Board.

Read also, a leading article in the "Daily Express" newspaper, dated the 16th September, referred to by Mr. Kavanagh in the above communication, and which he requests shall be read before the Board.

The committee take into consideration the following points embodied in Mr. Kavanagh's statement:

1. That Mr. Kavanagh refers to the private intimacy of Professor M'Gawley, Dr. Sullivan, and Mr. Cross, many years ago, with Mr. Durham Dunlop, then editor of the "Monitor" newspaper, published in this city, and an advocate of the national system of education.

2. That at a subsequent period Mr. Dunlop changed his opinion regarding the national system, and published a violent pamphlet containing most severe strictures on its working; that a large portion of the adverse information embodied in that pamphlet was obtained through the private intercourse of Mr. Dunlop with those officers, though not communicated to him, by them, from any hostile motive.

3. That Mr. Dunlop, who is now editor of the "Belfast Mercury," and has lately written most severely against the proceedings of the Board, continued on terms of social intercourse with one of the parties mentioned.

4. That Mr. Kavanagh asserts that on more than one occasion, particularly during the discussion of the Board in 1852-3 in reference to the question of religious books, which led to the resignation of the Archbishop and two other distinguished members of the Board, that some of the Dublin newspapers were not only kept constantly informed of the discussions which took place, but even that circumstances occurring at the meetings of the Commissioners were sometimes in the papers of next morning, and that those articles, (especially one in the "Evening Packet" of the 10th September last,) bear internal evidence that some of its statements and many of its comments were supplied by officers of the Board, either directly or indirectly.

5. That Mr. Kavanagh makes special reference to two articles in the "Daily Express" of the 4th and 16th September, which refer to him personally, the

latter commenting pointedly upon the advertisement of his arithmetic, and that he firmly believes the article of the 16th September was either written by an officer of the Board, or, at least, that the main facts of it were supplied from parties in the service.

6. That Mr. Kavanagh does not consider it necessary for him to extend his remarks beyond the above statements, or he could supply material facts in sustentation of the connexion adverted to, especially as to the "Daily Express."

With reference to the insinuation conveyed against either Mr. Cross or Dr. Sullivan, in paragraph No. 3, the secretary reads the following extract from an official letter from the latter gentleman, dated the 13th instant:

"Having heard that Mr. Kavanagh has said or insinuated that I have been mixed up in some way with the attack made upon the Board by Mr. Dunlop of the 'Belfast Mercury,' I beg to say, that I have not written a line to that gentleman on any subject for the last 15 years; and that since the time he attacked the national system of education, and ridiculed the programme and lectures of the professors, I never held 'social,' nor, in fact, any intercourse with him. I am quite aware that he entertains friendly feelings towards myself personally, and I have now no other feelings towards him; and I do and would speak to him if I met him; but this is all.

"With regard to the articles referred to I never saw them until they were shown me in Mr. Cross's office, and I at the time strongly condemned them, and still do condemn them."

Mr. Cross states, for the information of the committee, that for several years before he came to Dublin, at the end of the year 1838, he was a confidential friend of Mr. D. Dunlop; that the closest intimacy existed between him and that gentleman from the period he came to reside in this city and took charge of the "Monitor Newspaper," until some years ago, when he published a pamphlet, containing a most unwarrantable attack on the National Board. Mr. Cross further states, that strongly disapproving of the course adopted by Mr. Dunlop, he, Mr. Cross, resolved that his acquaintance with him should from that time cease; and accordingly that he has never since spoken or written to that gentleman.

The Committee having deliberated upon the several statements contained in Mr. Kavanagh's letter of the 5th November, in which he charges certain officers of this Board with writing articles in the newspapers hostile to the national system, or of supplying them with materials for their attacks; and insinuating that either Mr. Cross or Dr. Sullivan has furnished Mr. Dunlop, the editor of the "Belfast Mercury," with information by which he has been enabled to assail the proceedings of the Board in several articles recently published in his paper, the committee are unanimously of opinion,—

1st. That Mr. Kavanagh has altogether failed to substantiate the mischievous and unfounded charges contained in his letter of the 5th November, although he had ample time to produce sufficient proofs in support of it, had it been in his power to do so.

2. That in his attempt to justify the serious imputations, and on grounds equally futile, he has aggravated his original offence; and that he has shown a recklessness in making assertions which deserve the strongest condemnation of the Board.

Sixth Meeting. Thursday 26th November 1857.

Members present:

Right Hon. J. Hatchell.	James Gibson, Esq.
James O'Ferrall, Esq.	Right Hon. Alex. Macdonnell.

Read minutes of the proceedings of the Committee at its last meeting on Tuesday 24th instant.

The Committee approve of the Minute drawn up at the last meeting in reference to Mr. Kavanagh's charge of conspiracy against some of the officers of

of the Board, of writing articles for the Dublin newspapers hostile to the national system.

The secretary lays before the Committee a return, drawn up by the direction of the Resident Commissioner, containing a statement of the numerous official censures passed by the Commissioners upon Mr. Kavanagh, on various grounds, during the period of his service under them.

Resolved, That this return be referred to the Board at its next meeting.

The Secretary reads a draft of the report of the Committee, so far as their inquiry has extended, which is approved, and directed to be laid before the next meeting of the Commissioners.

The Secretary reports, that the following cases in which Mr. Kavanagh is concerned, have not been inquired into by them, and respecting which they request further instructions from the Board:—

1. Ballindine Industrial National School. Manager, Honourable G. Browne. Dispute between manager and Mr. Kavanagh as to the propriety of the report made by the latter on 16th May, as to certain books read or supplied by Mrs. Ridley to the girls, &c. during the hours for work.

2. Porterstown and Phœnix Park National Schools.—Manager, Rev. Dr. Sadleir, who charges Mr. Kavanagh with improper demeanour on the occasion of his visits, leaving improper messages for the manager, and of making improper remarks to the children respecting the reading of the Bible.

3. Talbotstown National School, County Wicklow. Mr. Kavanagh charges Mr. Fleming, district inspector, with dereliction of duty in recommending dismissal of teacher without examination, &c. Mr. Fleming's counter-charges.

4. Ballinacarrig National School, County Wicklow. Mr. Kavanagh pronounces it to be not conducted in a way suited for a monitor. Mr. Fleming disagrees, &c.

5. Complaint made by Mr. Kavanagh as to appointment of paid monitors in the Wexford District. Mr. H. P. Clarke, Inspector. Difference of opinion between them.

Ordered, That the Committee having inquired into six cases affecting the conduct of Mr. Kavanagh, and having recorded their decisions thereon, leave the Board to determine whether they consider it necessary to take up the consideration of the other cases referred to before coming to a final decision.

—No. 4.—

COPY of the REPORT of the Committee, with the Names of those Members (as laid before the Board on the 27th day of November last) of the Committee present when it was adopted.

THE following members of the Board of National Education appointed by Minutes of the 11th September, and 23rd and 30th October to inquire into various matters connected with the conduct of J. W. Kavanagh, Esq., one of the head inspectors of National Schools, have examined the matters referred to them and have agreed to the subjoined Report:—

NAMES OF THE COMMITTEE.

Very Rev. Dean Meyler.
Rev. Dr. Henry, President Queen's College, Belfast.
Right Hon. John Hatchell.
Robert Andrews, Esq., LL.D., Q.C.
James Gibson, Esq.
James O'Ferrall, Esq.
Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell, Resident Commissioner.

Your Committee held meetings on the following days, viz, 14th, 16th, 18th, 21st, 24th and 26th November; at which the following members were present:—

First Meeting;—Dean Meyler, Rev. Dr. Henry, Robert Andrews, Esq., James Gibson, Esq., James O'Ferrall, Esq., Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.
Second Meeting:—Right Hon. John Hatchell, Dean Meyler, Rev. Dr. Henry, Robert Andrews, Esq., James Gibson, Esq., James O'Ferrall, Esq., Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell.
Third Meeting:—Right Hon. J. Hatchell, James Gibson, Esq., James O'Ferrall, Esq., Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.
Fourth Meeting:—Right Hon. J. Hatchell, R. Andrews, Esq., J. Gibson, Esq., J. O'Ferrall, Esq., Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.
Fifth Meeting:—Right Hon. J. Hatchell, Dean Meyler, R. Andrews, Esq., James Gibson, Esq., J. O'Ferrall, Esq., Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell.
Sixth Meeting:—Right Hon. J. Hatchell, J. Gibson, Esq., J. O'Ferrall, Esq., Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell.

Your Committee have taken into consideration the following matters relating to Mr. Kavanagh, together with the correspondence in each case, and have come to a decision on each case.

Your Committee, before entering upon the investigation took into consideration a letter from Mr. Kavanagh, dated 13th November referred to them by the Board, claiming, "if not the right, at least the privilege to be present at the sittings of the Committee in order to take notes and watch the proceedings," &c.

Your Committee decided that Mr. Kavanagh's application which the Commissioners had already designated as "most offensive and insubordinate" should be declined.

Your secretary, Mr. Cross, having laid before your Committee the various documents forming the ground of inquiry into Mr. Kavanagh's conduct, your Committee resolved to proceed in the following order:—

No. 1.—Mr. Kavanagh's advertisement announcing the fifth edition of his "Treatise on the Principles and Practice of Arithmetic."—*See* Appendix (A.)

In connexion with this subject, your Committee had had before them a minute of the Board dated 11th September, in which Mr. Kavanagh was severely censured; and informed that he acted with great impropriety and indiscretion in drawing up and issuing the document in question.—*See* Appendix (B.)

Your Committee find, first, that Mr. Kavanagh has endeavoured to promote the sale of his "Treatise on the Principles and Practice of Arithmetic" by an advertisement printed and intended to be issued by his directions, which is calculated to lead to improper inferences on the part of monitors, pupil teachers, teachers, inspectors, and the public, not only that the work ought to be preferred to those published and sanctioned by the Board; but also, that monitors, pupil teachers, and teachers would derive peculiar advantages from using it, amongst others, that their classification would be favourably reported on by the inspectors.

Secondly. That when Mr. Kavanagh published that advertisement, he held the important and influential office of head inspector under the Board, and that shortly before its publication he had received a copy of the following minute dated 5th June 1857, viz.:—

"That Mr. Kavanagh be informed that the Commissioners conceive that the works on arithmetic already supplied by the Board to the National Schools are sufficiently good, that it is not advisable to multiply the number of books on the same subject, and that for these and other reasons, which the Commissioners do not think it necessary to specify, they regret they cannot comply with his application." [To place his Treatise on Arithmetic on the list of books sanctioned for the use of National Schools].

Thirdly. That in October 1844, Mr. Kavanagh addressed the teachers on training at Glasnevin, in terms similarly calculated to promote the sale of the same work; and that on the 25th of that month, he had been informed by order of the Board, that in so addressing the teachers in reference to that book he had misconducted himself.

Your Committee are therefore unanimously of opinion that Mr. Kavanagh is deserving of the censure passed upon him by the Board in the minute already referred to, with respect to this transaction.

No. 2.—Mr. Kavanagh's address before the British Association, on the 1st September,

September 1857, on the "Rise, Progress, and Prospects of Popular Education in Ireland." Your Committee, after a full consideration of the conduct of Mr. Kavanagh in this matter, come to the following resolutions:

First. That Mr. Kavanagh acted with great indiscretion in delivering his address before the British Association, without having first consulted and obtained the sanction of the Commissioners.

Secondly. That Mr. Kavanagh was also blameable for having introduced into that address various topics calculated to provoke controversial discussion amongst opponents and friends of the national system of education in Ireland.

Two members of your Committee dissented from the foregoing resolutions, James Gibson and James O'Ferrall, Esqrs.; the former assigns his reasons, in writing, as follows:—"That although he considers that Mr. Kavanagh should have abstained from making his address before the British Association without the express permission of the Commissioners, and that in making such address, he (Mr. Kavanagh) has evinced a want of discretion calculated greatly to diminish confidence in his judgment, yet, inasmuch as the Board has publicly recorded its disclaimer of having in any way authorised Mr. Kavanagh's address, or of being responsible for its statements, he (Mr. Gibson) does not think (taking into consideration all the circumstances attending the delivery of that address) that any further censure should be passed upon Mr. Kavanagh in reference to this matter."

Mr. O'Ferrall dissents verbally; but at a meeting of the Board on the 27th November he sent in a written protest.—*See* Appendix (C.)

No. 3.—The correspondence of Mr. Kavanagh and Mr. Mahony, district inspector, relative to the depression from the 3d division of 1st class to 2d division of the 2d class of Mr. Thomas J. Little, master of Keash National School, county Sligo, by order of the Board in May 1856, and relative to the measures adopted by Mr. Kavanagh to have Mr. Little restored to his former class.

Your Committee had before them with reference to this case the following documents:—

I. Extract from District Inspector Mahony's report, showing the grounds on which the Commissioners depressed Mr. Little in his classification.—Appendix (D.)

II. Mr. Kavanagh's observations in the classification sheet with reference to the district inspector's report.—Appendix (E.)

III. Mr. Kavanagh's letter of the 1st July 1857, defending the course pursued by him in this matter.—Appendix (F.)

On this part of Mr. Kavanagh's case your Committee resolve unanimously, as follows:—

First. That Mr. Kavanagh has sought to effect the restoration of Mr. Little to his former class by irregular and undue means, not having visited Mr. Little's school to ascertain his qualifications for conducting it, or to test his efficiency in school-keeping, by which alone Mr. Kavanagh could form a correct judgment on the merits of the case.

Secondly. That Mr. Kavanagh has deliberately misrepresented the grounds upon which the Commissioners decided upon lowering Mr. Little in his class, their decision on the case having been founded on a very strong condemnatory report of Mr. Mahony, the district inspector, which Mr. Kavanagh designates in his remarks in the classification sheet "as only slightly unfavourable."

Thirdly. That in Mr. Kavanagh's explanatory letter, dated 1st July 1857, defending the course he pursued in this matter, he has used language disrespectful to the Commissioners, and unbecoming an officer in their service holding his high position.

Fourthly. That in Mr. Kavanagh's observations on the classification sheet, referring to the order of the Board directing Mr. Little to be depressed, he has impugned their decision in terms of which they disapprove.

No. 4.—Report of Mr. Kavanagh upon the manner in which the official books and other records are kept by the inspectors in his district, particularly with regard to the case of Mr. Mahony, Mr. M'Sweeny, Mr. Fleming, Mr. H. P. Clarke, and Mr. O'Carroll, together with the correspondence relating thereto.

Your Committee came to no decision on this case.

No. 5.—Mr. Kavanagh's protracted delays and irregularities in the transmission of his journals and other official documents, &c. &c.

Your Committee had before them in relation to this case the following documents:—

I. A statement drawn up by the Inspection Department, showing Mr. Kavanagh's irregularities and delays in the transmission of his journals (in one case for seven weeks), and exhibiting great neglect in the answering of letters, which caused inconvenience to the officers of the Inspection Department, and prevented them from knowing how Mr. Kavanagh was occupied, or what duties he was performing.

II. Observations on Mr. Kavanagh's letters in relation to that statement, and referring particularly to his neglect in making arrangements in due time for the organisation of the schools in the Dublin district, which were delayed from the 19th January to the end of the month of March.

III. Letters dated 28th July and 5th October 1857, from Mr. Kavanagh, commenting on the foregoing documents, and defending himself against the charge of having endangered the success of the organisation scheme, by delaying to bring it into operation at the period required by the order of the Board.

Your Committee having given full consideration to this portion of the case submitted to them, are unanimous in finding:—

First. That the charges contained in the statement prepared in the Inspection Department of numerous irregularities in the transmission of his journals and other official documents, and of protracted delays in answering letters, has been proved, that Mr. Kavanagh's explanations are not satisfactory, and that he has been guilty of unjustifiable neglect.

Secondly. That the reason assigned by Mr. Kavanagh in his letter, dated the 5th October 1857, for not taking steps in proper time to make the necessary preliminary arrangements for introducing the organisation system into the national schools in the Dublin district, do not exonerate him from blame during the days when he was in town, or its vicinity, when he was occupied in other business, not coming within the order of the Board, regarding organisation to which he should have devoted himself exclusively. Your Committee, however, while they cannot acquit Mr. Kavanagh of the charge of inattention to official orders, consider that his energy, perseverance, and success in subsequently working the plan, and removing difficulties which might have obstructed its progress, deserve their commendation.

Thirdly. That the language used by Mr. Kavanagh in his correspondence in reference to that charge, is marked by the same objectionable and unofficial tone which your Committee has observed with so much regret and disapprobation in other portions of his letters and official documents which have been laid before your Committee in the course of the present inquiry.

No. 6.—Charge preferred by Mr. Kavanagh against the officers of the Board, of writing articles in the Dublin newspapers hostile to the system of national education, or of supplying materials for their attacks, as contained in the following extract from Mr. Kavanagh's letter, dated 17th September 1857:—

"I am sorry to be compelled to express my firm conviction, a conviction frequently expressed for the past three years by several other officers of the Board, that there is a connexion (through whom I am unable to prove) between the portion of the Dublin press, notoriously unfavourable to the national system and to its sincere supporters, and some persons in the Board's service. An examination of the files of some of these papers, during the inquiry of 1854, in reference to Professor M'Gawley's case more recently, and the number of the 'Daily Express,' for the 16th instant, can leave no doubt whatever as to the fact. Not only is this so, but as far back as the 7th instant, I was warned by a kind and influential friend, and since by others, that both officially, and through the press, the combined and simultaneous attack would be made upon me, because of the success that had attended my paper, and the attention which had been shown to me in the British Association and elsewhere."

Your Committee find, upon reference to the correspondence, that the Board called on Mr. Kavanagh, by their order of the 25th September, to state if he had any

any proof whatever to produce in support of the very serious charge he had preferred against some of the officers of the establishment, and that after a delay of more than six weeks (for which he assigned various reasons), his reply, dated the 5th November, was received, *see* Appendix (G.), from which your Committee annex the following extract:—

"The 'Dublin Monitor' newspaper, edited by Mr. Durham Dunlop, was at first favourable to the Board and to its administration; and contained very many leading articles upon the national system. The editor was the intimate private friend and social companion of Professors Sullivan and M'Gawley, and of Mr. Cross: it will not be denied by any of these parties that when Mr. Dunlop changed his tactics, and published a pamphlet containing most severe strictures upon the working of the system, a large portion of the adverse information was obtained through the private intercourse with these officers. I am far from imputing to them any hostile motive in imparting this information, which I should rather believe was obtained when and where it was not expected to be used as it came to be; but I have reason to know that Mr. Dunlop, now editor of the 'Belfast Mercury,' and who has lately written most severely against the Board in reference to Professor M'Gawley, continued on terms of social intercourse with one of the parties mentioned."

In reference to the foregoing allegations, your Committee had before them a letter, dated 13 November 1857, from Dr. Sullivan, stating as follows:—

"Having heard that Mr. Kavanagh has said or insinuated that I have been mixed up in some way with the attack made upon the Board by Mr. Dunlop, of the 'Belfast Mercury,' I beg to say that I have not written a line to that gentleman on any subject for the last 15 years; and that since the time he attacked the national system of education, and ridiculed the programme and lectures of the professors, I have never held 'social,' nor in fact any intercourse with him. I am quite aware that he entertains friendly feelings towards myself personally, and I have now no other feelings towards him, and I do and would speak to him if I met him; but this is all. With regard to the articles referred to, I never saw them till they were shown me in Mr. Cross's office; and I at the time strongly condemned them, and still do condemn them."

Mr. Kavanagh having introduced in his letter of the 5th November the name of your secretary, Mr. Cross, the latter made the following statement to your Committee, viz.:—

"That before he came to Dublin at the end of the year 1838, he was a confidential friend of Mr. Dunlop; that the closest intimacy existed between them from that period until some years ago, when Mr. Dunlop published a pamphlet containing an unwarrantable attack on the National Board; and that he (Mr. Cross) strongly disapproving of the course adopted by Mr. Dunlop, resolved that his acquaintance with him should cease from that time, and that accordingly Mr. Cross has never since spoken or written to that gentleman."

Your Committee, after a careful consideration of the documents and explanations submitted to them, are unanimously of opinion,—

First, that Mr. Kavanagh has altogether failed to substantiate the mischievous and unfounded charge contained in his letter of the 5th November, although he had ample time from the date of his first letter on the subject to produce proofs in support of it, if it had been in his power to do so.

Secondly, that in his attempt to justify these imputations, and upon grounds equally futile, he has aggravated his original offence, and has shown a recklessness in making assertions, which deserve the strongest condemnation of the Board.

Your Committee have thought it right to refer to the consideration of the Board at its meeting on Friday next, a return, prepared by the direction of the Resident Commissioner, containing a statement of the numerous censures passed upon Mr. Kavanagh, by order of the Commissioners, on various points relating to his official conduct since he entered their service.—*See* Appendix (H.)

Your Committee having investigated six cases, submit this as their report thereon; with regard to the other five cases, a list of which has been laid before them,

them, your Committee leave it to the Board to determine whether it is necessary for the Committee to enter upon the consideration of them, before the Board comes to a final decision on the cases included in this report.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

Maurice Cross,
James Kelly, } Secretaries.

26 November 1857.

For the order of the Board on the foregoing Report, *see* Minutes of Proceedings dated the 27th November 1857.—Appendix (I.)

APPENDIX.

Appendix (A.)

Appendix (A.)

Just published, price 2 *s.*, free by post, 2 *s.* 4 *d.*

ARITHMETIC; Its Principles and Practice. By *James W. Kavanagh*, Esq., Head Inspector of National Schools.

THIS edition (5th), is considerably enlarged by new and important matter upon coins and coinage, decimal coinage, notation, decimals and interest.

The work is interspersed with ample directions as to the best mode of teaching the subject, and organising classes in it. In this respect, it is the only work of the kind which embodies both the entire science of arithmetic, and also the method of treating it as approved by all the head inspectors, and as practised in the central training and model school departments. Teachers, pupil-teachers and monitors who master its matter, cannot fail in any personal examination on arithmetic to which they may be subjected; and if they adhere to its form and method, they may feel confident, that in this most important branch, their classes will be efficiently taught and favourably reported on by the inspectors.

Published by Marcus and John Sullivan, 27, Marlborough-street, Dublin; or may be had through the author (Education Office), or through most of the District Inspectors.

Post-office orders, the best form of remittance.

Appendix (B.)

Appendix (B.)

EXTRACTS from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board, 11 September 1857.

MR. KAVANAGH is called before the Board in pursuance of the order made at the last day of meeting; and in answer to certain questions put by the Chairman, admits that he is the author of the notice or advertisement (to which the attention of the Commissioners was called at their last meeting) with reference to the new edition of his treatise on Arithmetic, that he gave directions to have 3,000 copies printed, 50 of which, with a copy of the book, he issued to the teachers in training, and one copy he presented to Mr. Keenan.

Ordered, that Mr. Kavanagh be informed that the Commissioners strongly disapprove of the language used by him in the above notice, and consider that it is calculated to lead the public, the national school teachers, pupil teachers and monitors to suppose, not only that his work on arithmetic ought to be preferred to those which are published and sanctioned by the Commissioners, but that their head inspectors would act upon this opinion, and that the majority of the district inspectors would serve as his agents in promoting the sale of the book.

Mr. Kavanagh is to be further informed that as he has admitted that he forwarded 50 copies of the advertisement, and of his arithmetic to the teachers in training at Glasnevin, and that he printed 3,000 copies of the advertisement, evidently (as the Commissioners conceive) with the object of circulating it more widely, the Commissioners consider that he has acted with gross indiscretion and impropriety in drawing up and issuing the document in question; and that they will take this matter into serious consideration when they proceed to decide on his conduct in relation to several other cases in which he is concerned, and which are now before them.

Appendix (C.)

I DISSENT from the opinion of the rest of the Committee:—

1st. Because the Minute of 1832 which Mr. Kavanagh is accused of violating, was never promulgated or embodied in the rules for the government of the inspectors. Mr. Kavanagh denies any knowledge of the terms of that Minute.

2nd. Because I entertain no doubt that the officials of the Board by whom this complaint is brought, were aware of Mr. Kavanagh's intention to read a paper upon "Popular Education," and ought in my opinion to have reminded him of this Minute, if they were aware of it.

3rd. Because, even if the terms of the Minute of 1832 had been made known to him, I doubt if the paper which he read comes within its terms, forbidding a discussion of the proceedings "of the Board."

And lastly,—Because I think the passages in Mr. Kavanagh's paper most objected to, may fairly bear another construction than that put upon them.

I fully admit that, in all propriety, Mr. Kavanagh should have applied for and obtained the permission of the Board to read the paper in question; but I do not think the Board ought to proceed further in the matter than it has already done by its disclaimer published in the newspapers, and the Minute of censure passed upon him.

(Initialed) *J. O. F.*

Appendix (D.)

EXTRACT of District Inspector *Mahoney's* Report, 21 April 1856, on Keash National School, County Sligo, on which Mr. *Little*, the Teacher, was Depressed in his Classification.

Defect in the Quality of the Instruction given.—Very indifferent reading, bad pronunciation, which the teacher had evidently taken no pains to correct; a general deficiency in grammar and geography, much of the latter being the result of too high classification.

Acquirements.—Apart from his classification, I can find no evidence of anything beyond the most ordinary capacity in the management of his school. He may be a good scholar, but certainly he is but an indifferent teacher.

Method.—Not more successful than 3^1, or even than many 3^2, teachers. Whatever his acquirements may be, it is evident that he is wanting either in diligence, or singularly deficient in ability to communicate instruction. He seems to have formed a very low estimate of what is to be expected from him, and there can be no doubt that he has been culpably inattentive to his duties. I have hesitated till now to express this opinion, though I had reason to form it at the previous as well as at the present visit.

State of School.—Stationary; or, at best, progressing so very far short of what might reasonably be expected from a teacher so highly classed, and so well remunerated, that it cannot be said to be progressing.

Appendix (E.)

OBSERVATION made by Mr. *Kavanagh*, Head Inspector, on the Classification Sheet, or Return of Examinations of Teachers, held at *Carrick-on-Shannon*, 7 and 8 January 1857; District 17.

THIS man (Thomas Little) was depressed in 1856 from 1^3 to 2^2 on a slightly unfavourable report on his school, by Mr. Mahoney, whose two previous reports,, as well as those of the former inspector, were decidedly favourable. Mr. Mahoney knew and felt, and states that the punishment was severe in the extreme, but he feared he would incur blame by so expressing himself to the office. Admonition is the usual punishment in such cases.

Appendix (F.)

Appendix (F.)

Keash National School, Roll No. , County Sligo.

Depression, by Board's Order, of Teacher *Thomas Little*, from the 1[s] (32*l.*) to 2[d] (24*l.*), on Mr. *Mahoney's* Report (21/4/56), and Recommendation of Mr. *Kavanagh*, Head Inspector, and Mr. *Mahoney*, District Inspector, to Restore Teacher to his former Rank on First Class.

Gentlemen,

For the first time, I learn from your instructions of the 26th ultimo, that a correspondence has been going on with Mr. Mahoney, in reference to this case, for upwards of four months; in compliance with your directions, I beg leave to state the course pursued by me in the matter, and, in doing so, I shall follow the precise order in which its several facts occurred.

Immediately after the depression of Mr. Little, the Board Order to that effect was advised to me in the usual manner, and about the same date I received a note from the Reverend C. Cosgrave, P. P., Manager of the School, complaining of this decision. I had not known, nor do I know, Rev. Mr. Cosgrave, and from the receipt of his note in May, until after the examination (held the following January), upon which his teacher was recommended for restoration, I purposely abstained from even acknowledging the receipt of that communication.

My impressions of Mr. Little's character were very favourable; he had been placed on 1st Class after an examination held by Messrs. McAwley and O'Galligan, and me in 1854, and I regarded the punishment as unusually severe.

On my way to the office to examine the report, or reports, which led to the depression of the teacher, I met Mr. Mahoney (31 May 1856), in the Lawn, and told him the case as I had heard it. At my request, he accompanied me to the Inspection Office, where I examined, with him, his report dated 21st April 1856, upon which the order for depression was made, and his previous reports of 19th November and 11th June 1855. I found that Mr. Mahoney's two reports for 1855 were at least so far satisfactory, that no admonition arose from them. I recollected that at the close of 1854, teacher was promoted on the combined grounds of attainments and efficiency, and it exceeded in severity all the instances of punishment to teachers which had ever come to my knowledge, to depress a man by one-fourth of his income upon a single unfavourable report of such a character. In answering the question, "Has the school improved or retrograded since last inspection?" Mr. Mahoney, epitomising his opinions of the school, says, "School is stationary; or, at least, progress so very far short of what might reasonably be expected from a teacher so highly classed, and so well remunerated, that it cannot be said to be progressing."

I stated to Mr. Mahoney, that as he admitted that the punishment was extremely severe, and as he did not expect that his report would bring anything beyond a severe admonition to the teacher, it was his bounden duty, on receipt of the advice of the Commissioners' order, to request a reconsideration of the case, with a view to modification of the sentence.

Mr. Mahoney's statements as to any suggestion on my part to modify or unsay anything which he had said in his report, if he really means to state that I made any such suggestion, are simply without any foundation whatever. He made no recommendation, or gave no suggestion as to the form or amount of punishment; and to suggest to him to alter or modify the facts and opinions connected with his inspection of a school which I had never visited, is a line of conduct which I am incapable of pursuing. Mr. Mahoney's statement, that I arrived at the conclusion as to the severity of the punishment "solely and exclusively from the evidence supplied by the report" (26/4/56), is also quite incorrect, as I examined in his own presence his two previous reports upon the school. These reports (June and November 1855) brought me back to 1853 and 1854, and the close of the latter was the date of the teacher's promotion, when Mr. O'Galligan reported most favourably of his worth as a schoolmaster. It is upon a consideration of all these, and not upon a single report, that my opinion as to the severity of the punishment was founded.

I know not how, or upon what grounds, Mr. Mahoney can speak so confidently of the views of the head inspectors in reference to depressions of which this case is a type; and certainly it is not from me that he has heard any expression of opinion to warrant his becoming the exponent of our opinions in the matter. The courts above and below, the pyramid, and the prerogatives, are all of his own creation, as are also the indecorum of interference, the judge and the jury. I am confident that I state the opinions of each of my colleagues, as well as my own, when I mention that I have never entertained views so utterly absurd as those put forward by Mr. Mahoney. I believe that not only may, and should, teachers be admonished, fined, and depressed, but even dismissed, on the reports, or even a single report, by a district or sub-inspector, according to the nature and circumstances of the delinquency. He (the court below) neither awarded, recommended, nor suggested the depression, and the court above (the head and district inspectors) were unanimous in the recommendation to the real and only court, the Commissioners, to reverse that decision.

The time for holding the examinations of the teachers arrived, and I directed Mr. Mahoney to summon Mr. Little. Mr. Mahoney stated his desire to see the man reinstated in his former rank, and also informed me that a report since made on his school was more favourable. I also requested that Mr. Little should bring with him to the examinations both the observation

observation books of his school, that I might fully examine into the recorded details of the working of his school for years back.

The teacher was examined on the 7th and 8th January last, and his answering was equal, as it had proved on a previous occasion, first class. He had not attended the written portion of the examinations held in March 1856, because he was then on first class, and depression did not arise until May; but he had attended both written and oral in 1854, when he proved his fitness in all portions of the course for the rank to which he was then promoted.

Not the slightest difference of opinion existed between Mr. Mahony and myself, as to the recommendation made to restore the teacher to his former position. Respecting the observations made by me upon the classification sheet, it is perfectly clear from their nature and phraseology, that they were mine and mine alone, and would have been entered there to explain the peculiarity of the case, whether Mr. Mahoney withheld or lent his concurrence to them. We had been up to a very late hour on Friday night (January 9), marking the written exercises of the schoolmistresses, and classifying both sexes; on Saturday morning I wrote out the classification sheets, and a few minutes before the coach drove up (half-past 9 o'clock, I think) in the morning, I sent for Mr. Mahoney to sign the sheets; he was barely in time to do so, and a few matters (Roll Nos., &c.) required to be filled; I left the sheets in his hands for some days. On their being returned, I added, before sending to the office, the observations referred to, in order to explain the restoration of the teacher. In numbers of instances, I have, when necessary, written observations of my own on the classification sheets, sometimes with my initials annexed, and sometimes indicating by their matter that they were mine alone, and that the district inspector had no connexion with their composition.

Although they concern Mr. Mahoney and not me, I think it right to notice the remarks made upon his report of the 18th November last, in your letter to him, dated 13th February 1857. Any person reading the remark that "out of 40 pupils present and examined, there was not one able to read the 3rd book or any higher, nor one knowing the maps of Europe and Ireland, &c.," would naturally understand that the 40 were expected to answer to these grades; whereas 10 of the children were classed in first, 13 in second, 12 in sequels, 9 in the lower one, and only 3 in the third, and 3 in the fourth book. Now, as the three in the third book may have been only recently removed thereto, the only pupils that you could expect, necessarily to read third book, as desired, were the three in fourth book. Inspector wrote of both classes in observation book, third and fourth, "These are too highly classed; they should at once begin the third book, be exercised on the meaning of each lesson, and receive frequent repetitions in the subjects of the lessons read by them. Their proficiency is generally fair, except in reading and explanation." From this you may perceive that the inspector was satisfied with the proficiency in geography, penmanship, &c., in all, except reading, arising from over-classification, an error of judgment, and explanation. He also reports, that the proficiency was fair in each of the first, second, and sequel classes. Subject-matter, and connected therewith, meaning of words, being the only other points below satisfactory.

I beg leave now to rehearse the main facts of this case. Thomas Little is 25 years of age, and was educated in Artane National School, and in the Central Model School, Marlborough-street. He was appointed to Newcastle National School in March 1850; placed (3^1) by Messrs. Butler and M'Dermott in 1851; trained in the ordinary class 1852, and obtained 2^2 from professors, on special class in autumn 1852, and obtained 2^1, a higher rank very rarely given, on leaving. Appointed to Keash National School, November 1852; classed 1^3 in December 1854, by Mr. McAuley and me. Mr. O'Galligan reporting that he should be recalled to the oral examination, and that his school was creditably conducted. This man had never received a reprimand of any kind, and the four reports on his school, by Mr. O'Galligan were fair; the first two, by Mr. Mahoney, were such as at least brought no censure, and, at last an unfavourable report is made by Mr. Mahoney. Without previous warning, admonition, or trial, this man, after six years' good character, is at once degraded two important steps, and deprived of one-fourth of his income. This, I believe to be severe, and, so far as I know, unprecedented. I took such steps to put the matter before the Commissioners as the nature of my office permitted: and I have left nothing undone to satisfy my own conscience, that in making the recommendation for the restoration of the teacher's rank, to which the inspector fully agreed, I have *bonâ fide* grounds on which to rest the case.

I remain, &c.

(signed) *James W. Kavanagh,*
Head Inspr. N. Schools.

The Secretaries, Education Office.

P. S.—A few, perhaps six since 1847, cases have occurred in which teachers were promoted, who had attended the oral examinations only, and several were dismissed thereupon. In the former class there were always strong reasons in favour of, or to justify it; the last case is that of the teacher of Balla Male, Sir R. L. Blosse's school, who was promoted 2^1 to 1^3, on oral examination only.

(signed) *J. W. K.*

Grenville, Rathgar, 1 July 1857.

Appendix (G.)

Appendix (G.)

Gentlemen, Rathgar, 5 November 1857.

In my letter of September 17, respecting the paper lately read by me before the British Association, I stated, "I am sorry to be compelled to express my firm conviction, a conviction frequently expressed for the past three years by several other officers of the Board, that there is a connexion, through whom I am unable to prove, between the portion of the Dublin press notoriously unfavourable to the national system, and to its sincere supporters, and some persons in the Board's service," and I am called upon to furnish any evidence in support of this assertion.

"The Dublin Monitor" newspaper, edited by Mr. Denham Dunlop, was at first favourable to the Board and to its administration, and contained very many leading articles upon the national system. The editor was the intimate private friend and social companion of Professors Sullivan and M'Gawley, and of Mr. Cross. It will not be denied by any of these parties, that when Mr. Dunlop changed his tactics, and published a pamphlet containing most severe strictures upon the working of the system, a large portion of the adverse information was obtained through the private intercourse with these officers. I am far from imputing to them any hostile motives in imparting this information, which I should rather believe was obtained where and when it was not expected to be used as it came to be, but I have reason to know that Mr. Dunlop, now editor of the "Belfast Mercury," and who has lately written most severely against the Board in reference to Professor M'Gawley, continued on terms of social intercourse with one of the parties mentioned.

I heard from many persons, that on the occasion, some few years since, of an unpleasant discussion between some of the staff in the Inspection Office, which led to serious consequences, the occurrence was communicated by some of the same staff to the "Christian Examiner," notoriously hostile to the national system, and thereupon it charged the Board with abetting ribbonism.

During the discussions at the Board in 1852-53, in reference to the question of the religious books, it was an ordinary topic of remark and surprise, that not merely were some of the Dublin press kept, *au courant*, informed of the discussion, but even that circumstances occurring at the meeting of the Board were sometimes in the papers of next morning.

The last article in the "Evening Packet" newspaper (10th September 1857), upon the M'Gawley controversy, headed "The Irish Star Chamber," bears internal evidence that some of its statements and many of its comments were supplied by officers of the Board, either directly or indirectly.

The portion of the question which immediately applies to myself is the newspaper comments upon me, and the paper read by me at the meeting of the British Association. The "Daily Express" of the 4th September contains a leading article upon that paper, and in the same number large extracts from its matter; that journal resumes the subject in a leader of the 16th September, and which bears the clearest evidence upon every portion of it, that it was either actually written, which I firmly believe, by an officer of the Board, or at least that the main facts of it were supplied from parties in the service. In town and country no person who has spoken to me upon the subject entertains any doubt upon the matter as to the materials of the articles having been supplied from official sources. What had the advertisement as to my arithmetic to do with the professed topic of the paper read by me before the British Association? What do Mr. Godkin and Mr. Robinson know of my private history? Where did they ascertain that I had been a pupil in a school of Lady Dover's? How, or by what law of chance did the two topics, the paper and the advertisement, which had been before the Board on the Friday previous, meet in the same article in the Wednesday's number of the "Express?" In the whole history of the newspaper controversy upon national education, there is no parallel for the allusion that "I had the Board in my pocket," &c., in reference to my arithmetic, in the face of the fact that several have made large sums by the sale of their books through the schools, and through their official position, and I not a shilling; so clear and conclusive was the evidence that the article in question had been either written or suggested by official parties, that on its appearance persons in high position at once declared their conviction to that effect, and even to the extent that the very phraseology used the day previous in Marlborough street was woven into the article. There is nothing, the proof of which is indirect and resting on internal and circumstantial evidence, that I believe more firmly than that the article in the "Express" of the 16th September, was written by some party in the Board's service, and this belief is shared in by every one not connected with, as well as under the Board, to whom I have spoken upon the matter. It is not necessary for me to travel beyond what I have stated, or I could supply material facts in sustentation of the connexion adverted to, especially as to the "Daily Express."

I remain, &c.

The Secretaries, Education Office. (signed) *James W. Kavanagh.*

P. S.—I request that the number of the "Daily Express" for the 16th September be laid before the Board.

(signed) *J. W. K.*

Appendix (H).

EXTRACTS from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Commissioners, setting forth some of the Reprimands conveyed by their Order from time to time to Mr. *J. W. Kavanagh.*

BOOK.	DATE.	REPRIMANDS.
C. 285	9 June 1842	- - Mr. Kavanagh charged by Mr. Rintoul with disobedience and disrespect. Mr. Kavanagh expresses his regret, and promises to be perfectly subordinate in future. The Commissioners deem further steps unnecessary.
G. 232	21 Aug. 1851	- - The Commissioners having read a letter from Mr. Kavanagh, with reference to the correspondence of the Rev. Mr. Connor, regarding the alleged inaccuracies in Dr. Patten's report on the opening of the Dunmanway District Model School: Mr. Kavanagh is informed that the Commissioners have observed, with regret and dissatisfaction, the unofficial and intemperate tone in which some portions of his letter are expressed. Letter returned to him, with orders to draw up another, containing all the facts of the case; but without any comments of a personal or offensive kind.
H. 323	1 Oct. 1852	- - The Commissioners having considered a letter from Mr. Kavanagh, recommending the appointment of D. Creed, as agricultural boarding pupil in Dunmanway District Model Agricultural National School, from the 1st May last, at which time he entered on his duties: Mr. Kavanagh is ordered to be acquainted with the surprise and dissatisfaction of the Commissioners, that he should have appointed this person without the previous sanction of the Board.
K. 53	21 Feb. 1854	- - The Commissioners having under their notice several newspaper reports of the proceedings of the Galway Poor Law Guardians, regarding unfavourable statements made by Mr. Kavanagh as to the management, &c., of the workhouse schools; also explanatory letters from Mr. Kavanagh: he is ordered to be informed that, without entering into the question of the accuracy or inaccuracy of his allegations regarding the school, the Commissioners are clearly of opinion that he has acted with great indiscretion in attending the meetings of the guardians on the 13th and 27th of January. On which latter occasion, a very intemperate discussion took place, and language was used by him of which the Commissioners highly disapprove. The Commissioners also strongly deprecate the tone of Mr. Kavanagh's letter to the chairman of the guardians (Mr. O'Flaherty), and feel surprised that he (Mr. Kavanagh) should have so far neglected his duty as to have failed to apply for instructions with regard to the steps he should take. Mr. Kavanagh further informed, that if on any future occasion he should exhibit the same want of prudence, the Commissioners will feel it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to retain him in their service.
K 133	5 May 1854	- - The Commissioners having read Mr. Kavanagh's explanation regarding the statement in Mr. Connor's letter on behalf of Mr. Newell (late district inspector), that he (Mr. Kavanagh) " strongly impressed with the hardship of the case, and anxious to obtain a hearing from Mr. Newell, &c.:" Mr. Kavanagh is ordered to be reprimanded severely, and cautioned against again expressing any opinion publicly on the decisions of the Board.
L. 10	8 Dec. 1854	- - The Commissioners having had before them a letter from Mr. Kavanagh, stating that a note which he addressed to the editor of " The Times," about the report on workhouse and prison schools, was published in that journal, though not intended for publication: Mr. Kavanagh is ordered to be informed that the Commissioners consider he acted with great indiscretion in writing to the editor a letter, even though it was intended to be private.
L. 391	3 Aug. 1855	- - The Commissioners, in directing that each member of the Board shall be furnished with a copy of Mr. Kavanagh's printed reply to the resolution of the Board of Guardians of the South Dublin Poor Law Union, impugning the accuracy of certain statements in his " General Report:" order Mr. Kavanagh to be informed that the Commissioners disapprove of his having printed his letter without previous communication with them on the subject.

The

Appendix (H.)

BOOK.	DATE.	REPRIMANDS.
L. 505	9 Nov. 1855	- - The Commissioners having had before them copy of Mr. Kavanagh's reply to the two letters from the Poor Law Commissioners, impugning the accuracy of some of the statements in his general report on the workhouse and prison schools, for the purpose of deciding whether Mr. Kavanagh's reply (or "Vindication") should, in its present form, be published in the Appendix to the Annual Report: they decide in the negative, and direct Mr. Kavanagh to be informed, that while the Commissioners duly appreciate his valuable suggestions, &c., they deeply regret to observe that his vindication is drawn up in a style not only unofficial, but intemperate, with lengthened and acrimonious comments, calculated to defeat the object of the Commissioners, viz.: to remedy the defects existing in the workhouse schools. The Vindication is accordingly to be recast, and, if possible, condensed.
M. 74	25 Jan. 1856	- - The attention of the Commissioners having been directed to Mr. Kavanagh's advertisement in the "General Advertizer" of the publication of his vindication, with (as he there states), "the permission of the Commissioners of National Education," and the reasons assigned by him for introducing those words: Mr. Kavanagh is ordered to be informed, that the Commissioners consider his reasons altogether unsatisfactory, and the advertisement, as published, calculated to lead the public into the idea that the vindication was not only about to be published with their express sanction, but that it met with their approval. The Commissioners are the more surprised that Mr. Kavanagh should have adopted so improper a course, as he was already aware that the Commissioners not only expressed their strong dissatisfaction at the tone and language of his vindication, but stated distinctly, that they could not in any way be parties to its publication, &c., &c. The Commissioners consider Mr. Kavanagh's conduct in this transaction as highly reprehensible, and deserving of their unqualified censure; and he is informed that, if at any future occasion he should evince a similar spirit, or be guilty of the same indiscretion, they will be under the painful necessity of considering the propriety of dispensing with his services.
M. 107	22 Feb. 1856	- - The Commissioners having read letter from Mr. Kavanagh, requesting them to reconsider their order refusing payment to Mr. William Smith, for transcribing the "Vindication," Mr. Kavanagh is ordered to be informed that the Commissioners decline this request, and that they have had, from time to time, to censure him severely for the improper tone of his letters; and they deeply regret to find that there are passages in the letter now before them, the language and spirit of which are equally deserving of reprehension. The Commissioners much fear, from the several breaches of official propriety observable in Mr. Kavanagh's correspondence, that he has forgotten the position in which he stands in relation to the Board. His zeal and ability are acknowledged.
M. 183	6 June 1856	- - The Commissioners having considered a joint letter, signed by Mr. Kavanagh and the other four head inspectors, expressing objections to the arrangements for conducting the business of the inspection department, commenting on certain orders of the Board, and praying for redress of these alleged grievances, and for increase of salary: Mr. Kavanagh (with his brother head inspectors) is ordered to be informed that the Commissioners have received the above letter with the utmost surprise and disapprobation; they consider it to be marked throughout with an amount of indecorum, indiscretion, and insubordination never before exhibited by any persons engaged in their service. That such a document should have proceeded from the very men who ought to serve as models of prudence and fidelity adds greatly to his offence, and to the pain and astonishment of the Commissioners. Mr. Kavanagh further informed, that as it appears from every part of the letter, that he disapproves of the views of the Board on many most important particulars, and that he is discontented with his position, he is distinctly to understand, that if he is not satisfied with it, his proper course will be to withdraw from the service, and that the Commissioners are prepared at once to accept his resignation; should he decline to do so, he must be prepared for instant dismissal should he ever take such another step as that which has now drawn down upon him the severe condemnation of the Board. Nor will it be enough that he abstains, in future, from all active insubordination; he must, in his whole conduct, evince the most cordial co-operation with the Commissioners, and the most cheerful obedience to their will when conveyed through the offices of the central establishment.

The

BOOK.	DATE.	REPRIMANDS.
M. 462	1 May 1857	- - The attention of the Commissioners having been directed to an extract from letters from Mr. Kavanagh, requesting copy of a communication forwarded by Mr. H. P. Clarke, district inspector, in reference to his (Mr. Kavanagh's) report regarding the paid monitors of his district; Mr. Kavanagh is ordered to be informed that the Commissioners object exceedingly to the tone of his letter, and consider it undutiful and unbecoming in him to assume that they would suffer the case to be prejudged against him without enabling him to offer the fullest explanation respecting any remarks unfavourable to his character that have been made by Mr. Clarke.
M. 471	8 May 1857	- - The Commissioners having considered letter from Mr. Kavanagh, stating that the drift of his communication above referred to has been entirely misunderstood, and explaining what it was he intended to convey, Mr. Kavanagh is ordered to be informed, that it is the unanimous opinion of the Commissioners that his explanation is by no means satisfactory, and they direct that in future, he will be more guarded in his official correspondence, and abstain from making any comments on the acts of the Board, &c.
M. 577	11 Sept. 1857	- - Mr. Kavanagh having admitted that he is the author of the notice or advertisement with reference to the new edition of his treatise on arithmetic, that he gave directions to have 3,000 copies printed, 50 of which, with a copy of the book, he issued to the teachers in training, and one copy he presented to Mr. Keenan, Mr. Kavanagh is ordered to be informed, that the Commissioners strongly disapprove of the language used by him in the above notice, for reasons which they specify; also, that as he admits that he sent 50 copies of that advertisement and of the arithmetic to the teachers at Glasnevin, and that he printed 3,000 copies of the advertisement, evidently (as the Commissioners conceive) with the object of circulating it more widely; the Commissioners consider that he has acted with gross indiscretion and impropriety in drawing up and issuing the document in question, and they will take the matter into serious consideration when they proceed to decide on his conduct in relation to several other cases in which he is concerned, and which are now before them.
M. 583	18 Sept. 1857	- - The Commissioners having read letter from Mr. Kavanagh, containing certain explanations with regard to the above advertisement, Mr. Kavanagh is ordered to be informed that his letter has in no respect caused the Commissioners to alter their opinion; on the contrary, it rather makes them fear that he is incapable of perceiving, even after the gross impropriety of his conduct was pointed out to him, that he had committed a great offence. The only answer the Commissioners feel themselves warranted in giving to his present explanation, is, that, had such another advertisement been published by any of the officers of the Board to whom he alludes, even by one who had never before, as he has often done, incurred its severe censure, they would, without a moment's hesitation, have declared his conduct most indiscreet and improper, and have taken into consideration what adequate punishment ought to be inflicted.

(True copies.)

Maurice Cross,
James Kelly, } Secretaries.

EXTRACTS from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board, 27 November 1857, with reference to the Report of the Committee.

Extracts from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board of the 27 Nov. 1857.

THE Secretary read the report of the committee appointed by Board's order, 11 September, to inquire into various matters affecting the conduct of Mr. J. W. Kavanagh, head inspector.

Read, a memorandum, drawn up by James O'Ferrall, Esq. stating his reasons for dissenting from the resolution adopted by the committee, in reference to Mr. Kavanagh's address before the British Association, on Popular Education in Ireland.

Ordered, That a copy of this memorandum be embodied in the Appendix to the report of the committee.

 Read,

Extracts from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board of the 27 Nov. 1857.

Read, portions of a return, drawn up by the direction of the resident Commissioner, containing extracts from the minutes of the Board in which Mr. Kavanagh was, on several occasions, severely censured, and threatened with dismissal, by order of the Commissioners, for repeated acts of indiscretion, and for the disrespectful and insubordinate tone of his correspondence.

The Commissioners having fully considered the report of the committee, and the other documents now laid before them, agree that Mr. Kavanagh's case should be at once disposed of, without any further inquiry on the part of the committee; and they come to the following unanimous opinion thereon:—

Ordered, That Mr. Kavanagh be informed that the Commissioners have had under consideration the report of the committee, appointed on the 11th September last, to inquire into several matters of misconduct, alleged against him, and that they do not consider it necessary to instruct the committee to extend their investigation into any other cases that were referred to them.

The Commissioners deem it sufficient to confine themselves to those in the report, which they consider most serious; viz.:—

1st. Mr. Kavanagh's advertisement, announcing the 5th edition of his arithmetic.

2d. Mr. Kavanagh's correspondence and conduct relative to the depression in classification, by order of the Board, of Mr. Thomas J. Little, master of the Keash National School, county Sligo.

3d. A statement drawn up in the inspection department, showing numerous irregularities and protracted delays in the transmission of his journal and other documents; his unjustifiable neglect in not answering official letters for a long time after they were received; and his blameable conduct in not taking steps in proper time, to make the necessary arrangements for introducing the system of organisation into the National Schools of the Dublin District, which were delayed from the 19th of January to the commencement of March.

4th. Mr. Kavanagh's charges against some officers of the Board, of writing articles in the Dublin newspapers, hostile to the National system, or of supplying them with materials for their attacks; and his correspondence relating to those charges, particularly his letter of the 5th of November, in which he attempts to justify them.

Mr. Kavanagh is to be further informed that the Commissioners having fully considered the unanimous decision of the committee on the four points above enumerated (independently of any others), and having had before them a record of several of their minutes, in which he was severely censured and threatened with dismissal from their service for repeated acts of indiscretion, and for the disrespectful and insubordinate tone of his correspondence, are unanimously of opinion that his conduct has been of such a character as to deserve severe punishment. And the Commissioners accordingly direct that Mr. Kavanagh be depressed from the rank of head inspector, to that of district inspector of the first class, at the minimum salary of 328 *l.* per annum, from the 1st of January 1858, when a district will be assigned to him. Mr. Kavanagh is, meanwhile, to continue to discharge the duties of his present situation.

Ordered, That a copy of the foregoing Minute be transmitted, without delay, to Mr. Kavanagh.

(True copy.)

Maurice Cross,
James Kelly, } Secretaries.

Note 1.—Names of Members present at the Meeting when the above Minutes were passed:—

The Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Derry.
The Reverend Dr. Henry.
Sir Thomas N. Redington, K.C.B.
James Gibson, Esq.
M. Longfield, Esq., LL.D., &c.
James O'Ferrall, Esq.
The Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.

Note 2.—Mr. J. W. Kavanagh resigned his office on the 6th February 1858, and his resignation was accepted on the 12th of the same month.

— No. 5. —

RETURN of the Names of the Commissioners present at the Board's Meeting of the 27th day of November last (1857).

The Lord Bishop of Derry.	James O'Ferrall, Esq.
Rev. Dr. Henry.	The Right Hon. John Hatchell.
Sir T. N. Redington, K.C.B.	Montifort Longfield, Esq.
James Gibson, Esq.	The Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.

— No. 6. —

COPY of all COMMUNICATIONS which Members of the Board, or other Public Parties, may have forwarded to the Commissioners, or to the resident Commissioner, in reference to the case of Mr. *Kavanagh*, within the whole of the above period.

50, Upper Mount-street,
3 November 1857.

Dear Sirs,

THIS moment I received your note, informing me that my name has been placed on the committee for the investigation of Mr. Kavanagh's case, and requesting my attendance particularly on next Saturday.

In reply, I must say, that as my attendance upon any committee, much less one of such importance, on that or any other day, is wholly out of my power, I cannot accept the duty, and I must therefore request that my name be removed, and if necessary some other member of the Board appointed in my place.

I never before served on any committee of the Board, I cannot serve on this or any other. If it were an indispensable part of the duty of a Commissioner to do so, I should be compelled to resign the office.

I am, &c.
(signed) *J. J. Murphy*, M. C.

PAPERS.

National Education (Ireland).

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
19 *April* 1859.

[*Price* 2*s.* 8*d.*]

254.

Under 28 *oz.*